



3 1761 11895345 4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118953454>

CADON
X1
-D23



55 1990

55 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 19 November 1990

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 19 novembre 1990

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers





Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938. Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 19 November 1990

The First Session of the 35th Parliament of the province of Ontario opened at 2 p.m. for the dispatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of His Honour, L. M. Alexander, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the chamber, took his seat upon the throne.

Hon Mr Alexander: Pray be seated.

Hon Miss Martel: I am commanded by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to state that he does not see fit to declare the causes of the summoning of the present Legislature of this province until a Speaker of this House shall have been chosen according to law; but tomorrow, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, His Honour will declare the causes of the calling of this Legislature.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

ÉLECTION DU PRÉSIDENT

Clerk of the House: Members of the Legislative Assembly, it is my duty to call upon you to elect one of your number to preside over your deliberations as Speaker. Therefore, I ask for nominations for the office of Speaker.

Mr Henderson moved, seconded by Mr Callahan, that the member for the electoral district of Prescott and Russell (Mr Poirier) do take the chair of the House as Speaker.

Clerk of the House: The honourable member for Prescott and Russell?

M. Poirier : Oui, Monsieur le greffier, j'accepte.

Le greffier de la Chambre : L'honorable député de Prescott et Russell accepte la mise en nomination.

Are there any further nominations?

Ms Haslam moved, seconded by Mr Curling, that the member for the electoral district of Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr Warner) do take the chair of the House as Speaker.

Clerk of the House: Does the honourable member for Scarborough-Ellesmere accept the nomination?

Mr Warner: I accept.

Clerk of the House: Are there any further nominations?

Mrs McLeod moved, seconded by Mr McGuinty, that the member for the electoral district of Carleton East (Mr Morin) do take the chair of the House as Speaker.

M^{me} McLeod propose, appuyé par M. McGuinty, que le député de la circonscription de Carleton-Est

(M. Morin) prenne le fauteuil en tant que Président de l'Assemblée législative.

Le greffier de la Chambre : Le député de Carleton-Est accepte-t-il cette mise en nomination ?

M. Morin : J'accepte.

Yes, I accept.

Clerk of the House: Are there any further nominations?

Mrs Cunningham moved, seconded by Mr Ferguson, that the member for the electoral district of Carleton (Mr Sterling) do take the chair of the House as Speaker.

Clerk of the House: Does the honourable member for Carleton accept the nomination?

Mr Sterling: I accept the nomination.

Clerk of the House: Are there any further nominations?

There being no further nominations, I declare the nominations closed.

I now call for the voting booths and the ballot box to be put on the table.

If I could have your attention for a moment, please, we are now ready to move on to the actual voting procedure. A list of the candidates is now being posted in the voting booths and I am preparing the ballots here. I would ask you to mark the name in print, please, as legibly as you can make it, of your candidate so that the scrutineers will be able to identify for whom you are voting.

I would now ask the members to please come down to the middle aisle here and go behind your respective benches to the tables on either side, where members of the Clerk's staff will give you a ballot. Then I would ask you to come and mark it. Then the procedure is that after most of you have voted, I will give a final notice for people to come and vote. Once everyone has voted, the ballot box will be taken into a separate room with the two scrutineers from the Clerk's office—the two clerk assistants—and a representative from each party. After the count has been done, then a message will come back to me and I will be pleased to either announce that a Speaker has been elected or that there is a need for a second ballot.

I thank you very much for your co-operation. Let the voting begin.

1420

Clerk of the House: Are there any more members who have not voted and who would wish to vote? There being no more members who would wish to vote, I will therefore declare the voting over with.

The two clerk assistants, accompanied by the three whips, I take it, will proceed to the room behind the opposition lobby where they will proceed with the count. No numerical results will be given out. That is according to

the standing orders. As soon as a result is ready to be announced, we will ring the bells for five minutes for you to assemble and hear that one of the candidates has been elected as your Speaker or that there is need for a second ballot. Therefore, until the bells, this House stands recessed.

The House recessed at 1425.

1455

Clerk of the House: Order. It is my duty to announce that there is need for a second ballot.

The candidates for this second ballot are the member for Carleton East, the member for Carleton and the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

It is now my duty to ask that the voting booth be put back on the table.

Before we proceed to the vote, is there any candidate who wishes to withdraw at this time? There being no such withdrawal, I will now hand the ballots to the two tables and I would ask the members to proceed as in the first ballot: to proceed to the tables, gather up a ballot and proceed to the vote.

1510

Clerk of the House: I would like to ask if there are any other members who have not yet voted. Seeing none, I will therefore ask the Sergeant at Arms to remove the ballot box and the scrutineers to proceed to the count once again. I would like to remind honourable members that the bells will be rung five minutes before the next announcement.

The House recessed at 1511.

1534

Clerk of the House: Order please. I declare that you have elected David Warner, the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, to be your Speaker. I would ask the member for Perth and the member for Scarborough North to escort the Speaker to the chair.

The Speaker: As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted some three years ago, political life is quite predictable.

The process that has unfolded this afternoon has indeed been most gratifying. The greatest honour a parliamentarian can receive is the support and the vote and the confidence of her or his peers. It is a humbling experience. It is one which causes you to stop and think about the responsibilities that you inherit. They are responsibilities which I take very seriously, but with a sense of privilege, the privilege of serving you as your servant in the House, the privilege of trying to help with the interpretation of the rules and the procedures and

trying to establish the kind of atmosphere which will be conducive for all of us to conduct the business of the province.

I am certainly mindful of the history of the position of Speaker, dating back to the time when Charles I marched into the House of Commons and demanded from the Speaker the names of the people he thought were traitors. The Speaker chose to be silent, knowing full well that his silence could cost him his life, but it was in order to protect the very cherished freedom that we have, our democratic system, our opportunity to speak freely and without fear of reprisal. I am certainly mindful of that and although I do not expect to lose my head at any point, I certainly am more than willing to serve the members in the most honourable way that I can. I hope that over the time of this Parliament I will serve you with distinction and make you proud.

This is a unique opportunity for us and I think all of us are mindful that the mood of the public is such that they demand from their elected representatives the most thoughtful of discussions, the calmest of approaches, the most reasoned and reasonable of approaches to all the issues which we face. I know that all of us—because I know many of you personally—are quite capable of that.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome back those who are returning, many of whom are not just colleagues of mine but friends, friends I have not seen for a little while but friends just the same, and also to welcome the new members. This is, as you will find, a remarkable chamber in which there will be a free exchange of ideas and, hopefully, a very co-operative spirit that has developed on all sides. It is my intention as Speaker over the time of this Parliament to do everything I can to make sure that we do in fact have a very good working atmosphere, an atmosphere of mutual respect, because all of the members are equal in the eyes of the Speaker. The Speaker hears no favourites, the Speaker sees no favourites and the Speaker will do his best to make you proud.

I would like to also take this opportunity to welcome among us two former Speakers seated in the gallery, Speaker Edighoffer and Speaker Turner.

Lastly, as I said at the outset, I really, truly believe that during this Parliament we have a unique opportunity to construct an atmosphere which will not only make all of us proud, but in terms of our country, make this Legislature a model where calm and reason can be the order of the day and personal invective has no place in here. I pledge to you that I will do everything I can to make that a reality and I thank each of you for the support you have given. I hope to earn it every day with you. Thank you.

The House adjourned at 1540.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS
(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Monday 19 November 1990

Election of Speaker	Adjournment	2094
The Clerk of the House	Lists of members	
The Speaker	Members and their responsibilities	2095
Other business		
Recess		2094

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le lundi 19 novembre 1990

Élection du Président	
Le greffier de la Chambre	2093

HANSARD REPORTING SERVICE

Room 481, Legislative Building, Queen's Park, Toronto, M7A 1A2

Telephone (416) 965-1456

Index Inquiries: (416) 965-2159

Facsimile: (416) 963-1387

Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Editors: Alex Jenkins, *Deputy Chief*; Edward Patrick, *Supervisor*; Karen Bennett, Liese Binnie, Drummond Burgess, John Cambridge, Deborah Caruso, Anne Lynas, Steven Smal, Janice Spellerberg, Sheila Wawanash, Sharon Wyatt

Reporters (Tape): Kit Anderson-Knight, *Administrator*; Margaret Elkins, Wilda Ferguson, *Supervisors*; Jean Andrews, Sandra Arrizza, Peggy Brooks, Carolyn Brown, Arlene Cedilnik, Sharon Chalupiak, Karen Fischer, Margaret Grobicka, Timothy Humphries, Kathleen Oram, Arleen Oostwoud, Chantal Perron, Mary Sutton, Jacqueline Tarne, Lorraine Wills

Reporters (Shorthand): Pat Girouard, Beth Grahame, Carol McIntosh, Maureen Murphy

Reference: Teresa Hamilton, *Reference co-ordinator*; Miro Drobnjakovic

Index: Elise Sloga, *Chief*; Estelita Chan, Lynda Middleton

Editorial Assistants/Printer: Bob Bubba, Corrine Marnoch, David Woodruff, Eamon Kade

Secretary/Receptionist: Lorraine Cohen

Messenger: Robert Grahame

CADON
X1
-323



56 1990

56 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 20 November 1990

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 20 novembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938. Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 20 November 1990

The House met at 3 pm.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the chamber, took his seat upon the throne.

Hon Mr Alexander: Pray be seated.

The Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me and not to the assembly whose servant I am and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and country, hereby claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your person at all reasonable times and that their proceedings may receive from you the most favourable consideration.

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, I am commanded by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the assembly to Her Majesty's person and government, and, not doubting that the proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temperance and prudence, he grants and upon all occasions will recognize and allow the constitutional privileges. I am commanded also to assure you that the assembly shall have ready access to His Honour upon all suitable occasions and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable consideration.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

DISCOURS DU TRÔNE

Hon Mr Alexander: Mr Speaker, members of the Legislative Assembly, ladies and gentlemen:

I have the honour of welcoming you to the opening of the first session of the 35th Parliament of the province of Ontario.

It gives me particular pleasure to welcome those of you who are sitting as members of this Legislature for the first time. It is also a pleasure to see that so many of the new members are women and that the executive council of my new government includes more women than any cabinet in the history of Canada.

As a group of people accustomed to being on the outside of the established power structures in Ontario, my government will open Queen's Park to those who have never before had an effective voice in the corridors of power. It is a government that will listen to the people and respond to their needs to the best of its ability.

All of us in Ontario know that we are facing many challenges: an economy in recession; growing inequity; an environment where the air, land and water are increasingly polluted, and rising concern about Canada's future.

These challenges demand a new vision for Ontario, one which provides for a decent quality of life for all of us. We must build a society in which all Ontarians can achieve the best of which they are capable, have genuine access to education, culture, training and jobs and receive fair treatment from its institutions.

1510

En assumant ses fonctions, le gouvernement sait qu'il doit répondre à des aspirations élevées, mais il ne sera pas possible de satisfaire toutes les attentes. Le gouvernement n'en accepte pas moins son mandat avec confiance et enthousiasme. Il dirigera la province avec énergie et ambition de lui donner un élan jamais vu auparavant.

This speech is about principles. But it is also about the realities that must guide our decisions. Wealth must be created as well as shared. We must be more creative about ensuring that new wealth and opportunity can grow in Ontario.

However, politics is about far more than what we can all get: It is also about what we owe each other. Too many people have been left out and need to be included. The values of community and solidarity have been undermined and ignored. Quite simply, there is too much poverty and inequality in Ontario.

My government's first challenge is to earn the trust and respect of the people of Ontario. My government's integrity will be measured by the way this government is run and our relations with the people we serve. Our task is to guard against institutional arrogance and the abuse of power wherever they exist.

We will set clear standards of behaviour for the conduct of ministers, members of the Legislature and senior government officials. These standards will be developed in consultation with the other parties in the Legislature.

We will introduce "whistle blowing" guidelines to protect public employees who make public information on illegal or unethical behaviour. We will also recognize our employees' right to participate in political activities in the same way as any other citizen.

We will introduce legislation on conflict of interest at both provincial and municipal levels.

We will establish measures to ensure more fairness in appointments to government agencies, boards and commissions.

We must create a greater sense of integrity in the work of government. We are under no illusions that this is easy, since the public remains distrustful of governments and other large institutions. It is our job to address that cynicism and to overcome it. When my government makes mistakes, it will admit them.

Recessions hurt people. In Ontario, we are struggling against high interest rates, an overvalued dollar, the free trade agreement and unfair taxes.

Early in this session, the Treasurer will present a statement reviewing the province's economic outlook. It will include the immediate allocation of \$700 million for necessary maintenance and renovation of public sector facilities. These projects are ready to begin within the next several months. They will create critically needed jobs now. These funds will help address another serious problem my government has inherited—the accumulation of many years of inadequate financing of public infrastructure.

The recession has not fallen evenly either on people or on regions and communities. Across the north, single-industry towns are vulnerable. In southwestern Ontario and eastern Ontario, our industrial and agricultural bases are being battered. Central Ontario's tourism and renewable resource industries are hurting. We will work with the communities of these regions to seek ways by which all of the province benefits from sustainable economic development. In the immediate future, newly funded maintenance and renovation projects will have a positive impact throughout the whole province.

In working to meet our economic challenges, both during the recession and afterwards, all of us must become open to change and adjustment. But we must ensure that the burden of change does not fall solely upon workers and communities. A fairer and more democratic economy must share both the benefits and the burdens of change arising from the time of major economic adjustment in which we live.

To begin this transformation, my government will introduce in this session a number of measures to protect workers during this period of economic restructuring. It will introduce a wage protection fund for the workers of bankrupt companies. It will introduce support for labour adjustment committees in industries affected by dislocation. It will introduce stronger measures on layoff notice, severance and other adjustment issues.

Our goal is to foster a society where economic change will not mean a dramatic loss of income or self-esteem. Our goal for the future is a society in which change signals new opportunities for people and their communities. We will be guided by the belief that the democratic principles shared by all Ontarians must be extended throughout the economy. For this reason, we will ensure that workers can freely exercise their right to organize.

We will work with all the partners in the economy on the design and implementation of Ontario's laws, programs and tax system. Workers and governments have a profound stake in a more efficient economy that can make and sell goods and services at home and around the world.

Global trading relationships, the ways of organizing and conducting our work, the kinds of knowledge and skills our workers require—all these things are being transformed. My government recognizes that Ontario must compete in a worldwide marketplace. We need to develop stronger links with other jurisdictions.

As social democrats, my government believes in the need for a new relationship and respect among all the forces in the Ontario economy—labour, business, community organizations, government—so we can begin to work better together to achieve our common goals. New ways of co-operating will be needed. My government is determined to build a consensual, environmentally responsible economic strategy for the 21st century.

We must look beyond the recession and build a sound recovery. We must be more creative to help plan for new jobs and new investment. We will work with the private sector in ensuring more research and development, more innovation, more new jobs in new technologies. We are an open economy with a government determined to bargain for the best possible return on investment for the people of Ontario.

We must extend and diversify our international trade and industrial base. With workers who are ready and willing to learn new skills, good social services and a stable and high quality of life, Ontario will be well placed for new investment to create meaningful jobs for our people.

Our human resources will be key to our economic future. To face the challenges of the 1990s effectively, we must become a learning society where education and training are seen as fundamental to individual growth, where investment in people is understood to be as important as investment in capital or in research and development. My government will work with labour, business, community organizations and the educational sector to create new education and training partnerships. Strong, publicly funded institutions are crucial to lifelong education.

We cannot afford to lose the skills and abilities of Ontario's population because of discrimination. My government is firmly committed to both employment equity and pay equity. During my government's mandate, our goal will be to work with employers and employees to find practical ways of achieving equitable wages for all Ontario women. We will make early progress on redressing unequal pay in areas such as child care, where grievances have been long-standing and unresolved. After consultation, we will introduce employment equity legislation. We are confident the Ontario economy can provide equity for its citizens, while ensuring a fair level of profitability for its businesses.

While Ontario has become an increasingly urban province, the contributions of our farmers and rural communities remain vital. We will improve our programs to stabilize farm incomes. This and other measures will begin to build a social vision which recognizes the fundamental interdependence of farmers and food processors, consumers and producers, city and country. It is a vision which stresses co-operation and emphasizes the right of people in rural Ontario to share in the benefits of society.

We will work towards our communities becoming supportive environments where all people, including those who are vulnerable, can meet their full potential, participate in community life and make their contribution to society. In doing so, we recognize that saying yes to

their concerns will mean saying no to others whose claims are presented more loudly. These are never easy decisions, but when taken in a spirit of openness and frankness, we believe they will allow the public interest to be served.

1520

Pour atteindre à une plus grande justice, le gouvernement entend rester fidèle à son programme en matière sociale et lever les obstacles qui empêchent la participation pleine et entière de tous les citoyens à la vie de la province. Nous veillerons à la mise en place de modes de soutien à court et à long terme pour les personnes touchées par la récession et qui doivent essuyer les conséquences des politiques sociales et économiques régressives adoptées antérieurement.

Over its five-year mandate, my government will increase the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage; introduce pension reforms; revise rent review legislation; help to expand the supply of affordable housing, particularly non-profit housing, and extend child care. We will provide support for those who find themselves out of work and unable to provide for themselves and their families. We pledge to continue the reform of Ontario's social assistance system and address the shame of child poverty in the midst of affluence.

We will deal resolutely with violence against women and children. It is time for society to come face to face with this reality. Reports on advocacy for Ontario's most vulnerable citizens—the disabled and the frail elderly—have been gathering dust for too long. We will deal with this issue. We will also improve Ontario's family support program to ensure that support and custody orders are meaningful and not just pieces of paper.

The future wellbeing of Ontario depends in large measure on how we care for our children today. The range of public services to families has not caught up to the needs of working parents. Public policies and programs must reflect the realities of family life, the growing participation of women in the workforce, the balancing of work and family life and the changing role of the extended family in caring for children. We will introduce legislation to improve pregnancy and parental leave for working families.

We will provide for a common pause day to help strengthen family and community life while protecting small businesses and the rights of workers.

Our health and social services must be the best we can afford. We cannot, however, assume that spending more and more money will mean better services. Instead, we will look at the results of our spending to ensure the most effective use of public funds. We will work with health and social service professionals, community organizations, workers and consumers to improve health and social services.

We will complete plans to move government offices out of Toronto to other cities and towns in the province, but we will do so in a way that is fair and responsible to our employees.

Fairness also requires that we share the burdens as well as the benefits of our economic wellbeing. As a result of a legacy of special breaks and favours for a few, the public has lost faith in the tax system. Therefore, we plan to establish a Fair Tax Commission to assist us in the design of a tax system that is more equitable to every citizen of Ontario. This fundamental review will require the involvement of many people across the province.

There is an environmental crisis facing Ontario and it will require an extraordinary effort to meet it. We accept our duty to the future. We will need to assess our decisions not only by standards of social justice or economic growth, but in terms of their ecological integrity. We know that we cannot have a healthy economy without a healthy environment. A sustainable economy will provide added opportunities for new jobs, which will last into the future, and which will enhance, rather than harm, the environment. Our environment is more than the natural landscape. It is our individual health and wellbeing. It is our children's future.

We can no longer afford to be a throwaway society. We must recognize that most garbage is used material which still has a value to society. We must expand and enhance our efforts to reduce, re-use and recycle solid waste. The previous government established the objective of 25% waste diversion by 1992. Without tough measures, we will not meet that objective.

Our province's southern boundary touches all of the Great Lakes. These magnificent bodies of water have for too long been treated as waste dumps. We will act to protect our supply of clean water. We will conserve and manage this precious resource and the watersheds that support it. As a first step, we will introduce a safe drinking water act to set standards for water treatment and protect our people's health and safety.

Many of our roads are becoming too congested to work effectively. My government is committed to a program of expanded public transit, not only to help the movement of goods and people but as a strategy for improving the environment and the economy.

Nowhere is the link between the environment and the economy more evident than in forestry. In the past few years, our forests have been a cause for concern when they should have been a source of pride. We believe in sustainable forestry, and are determined to see that our forests are regenerated.

We believe that people have the right to seek legal action to redress environmental harm. We will introduce an environmental bill of rights in this session. We will seek the advice of the public on the specific details of the bill. This legislation will be an important step in giving individuals more control over the quality of their environment.

My government is proud to announce new energy directions for Ontario to protect the environment while ensuring that the province continues to have a reliable supply of energy at reasonable prices.

We plan to complete construction of Darlington and to bring the station into operation. This will provide the security of electricity Ontario needs for the immediate

future. The Environmental Assessment Board hearings on Ontario Hydro's 25-year demand and supply plan will continue. This will provide an opportunity for an independent evaluation of the economic, social and environmental aspects of all options, including conservation, for Ontario's electricity future.

Meanwhile, we will instruct Ontario Hydro to intensify its efforts and its investment in energy conservation. To that end, we will place a moratorium on new nuclear power facilities. We will ask Ontario Hydro to divert planned expenditures for new nuclear development towards the most comprehensive energy conservation and efficiency program ever undertaken by a utility in North America. These efforts to use energy more efficiently will also assist in reducing global warming. These new energy directions will be a challenge to all citizens of Ontario to take part in individual and community efforts to ensure the most efficient and environmentally sound use of our energy resources.

Our province enjoys great cultural diversity. My government sees strength in our differences, in learning from one another and enjoying the richness of our collective and individual heritage.

We attach great importance to the need to negotiate fairly with the first nations of the province. The previous government made some progress which we must surpass. We are determined to make major strides in negotiating aboriginal self-government and in improving the quality of life of aboriginal peoples in Ontario.

Par ailleurs, nous reconnaissons l'importance de la vaste population franco-ontarienne, qui apporte une énorme contribution à la vie de la province, et nous sommes déterminés à travailler en étroite collaboration avec la communauté francophone de l'Ontario afin de préserver ses droits.

We cherish our multicultural and multiracial diversity and we will work to preserve it and to benefit from it. We know that to achieve our social and economic goals, we must strive to achieve access, equity and the protection of the rights of all members of our society. Greater cultural, racial and linguistic understanding is an essential foundation for a society as diverse as ours.

We recognize the importance of the arts to the economy and to the quality of our lives. We will augment our support of artists and arts organizations through the Ontario Arts Council.

We plan to govern with a sense of partnership, a partnership that includes those who were neglected or left out in the past. No partnerships are more important than those with local governments. We intend to work with them so that together we can serve the people of Ontario.

1530

Ontario's realities—the environment, the economy, our social services and the challenges facing Canada itself—require leadership. Public frustration has as much to do with decisions postponed as with the sense that the people have not been heard. We will look for new and better ways to hear and respond to the voices of the people.

My government appreciates the contributions that its predecessors have made to the life of the province. It is a tradition we will respect. We want the advice, assistance and ideas of the opposition parties.

My government shares the serious concerns of many Canadians that our political institutions are no longer working as well as they must. There is dissatisfaction with governments in Canada and a sense that the country deserves better. The next five years will be crucial in overcoming the current constitutional deadlock. Ontario cannot set the national agenda on its own. We can only act with others on this issue, an issue which must transcend partisanship. My government will soon discuss with the Legislature our suggestions for future action. Canada deserves our best efforts.

Leadership is often about choosing when and where to intervene. We believe that in many areas the market can and should take the lead, with the public sector playing a facilitating role. But in certain cases, such as the delivery of auto insurance, public leadership is a more effective and equitable solution.

After a period of discussion, we will introduce, in the spring, a bill to reorganize the delivery of car insurance to the driving public. We plan to examine the experiences of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Quebec, other jurisdictions in North America and our previous provincial plans.

Our intention is to create a system that will provide the best service at a reasonable cost to drivers and at the same time ensure access to a fair settlement of claims for personal and other damages. We believe that a driver-owned plan can provide the best service to the public.

It has not been our intention in this speech to touch every conceivable base or to announce every measure that we will undertake in our mandate. Rather, this is an initial agenda for the priorities of the government, recognizing that we cannot do everything, and that to govern is to choose.

Over the life of our government there are many things that we want to accomplish. My government looks forward to a productive and lively session, where it will do its best to listen before it acts, recognizing that at the end of the day our government was elected to make decisions. There is much work to be done if we are to bring to Ontario the new fairness and openness that the people expect of us.

Puisse la divine Providence guider vos délibérations.

In our Sovereign's name, I thank you.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech, which I will now read. [Reading dispensed with.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: This bill contains a provision which will permit Ontario vendors to exclude the goods and services tax from the base for Retail Sales Tax Act purposes. It also implements the proposals contained in the former Treasurer's budget of 24 April 1990. These changes are designed to reduce the confusion surrounding the introduction of the federal GST. In addition, compensation payments to Ontario vendors will be enriched.

MOTION

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Miss Martel moved that the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration tomorrow, Wednesday, 21 November 1990.

Motion agreed to.

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

The Speaker: It is a great honour to beg to inform the House that the member for the electoral district of Brant-Haldimand is recognized as leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

ROLL OF MEMBERS ELECTED

The Speaker: I also beg to inform the House that the Clerk has laid upon the table the roll of members elected at the general election of 1990.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

MOTION EN VUE D'ADJOURNER

Miss Martel moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr Nixon: Mr Speaker, before you put the motion, I wonder if you would permit me, on behalf of my colleagues, to congratulate you on your election and to indicate to you that on all reasonable occasions you can count on our support.

I think it is suitable, at the same time, to express our goodwill and congratulations to the Premier and his colleagues as they form a new government. We experienced the same thing, with his assistance, just five years ago, and I believe our wish for him is not only to achieve a similar level of accomplishment but also to enjoy the experience of giving some leadership to the province and working in this House.

I think it is also appropriate, as His Honour indicated, since there are so many coming into this House for the first time, to express congratulations to all and, I believe, to give an assurance that whatever side of the House we happen to be sitting on and representing for the time being, we all share a same commitment to the betterment of the province and the support of the democratic system.

Mr Harris: Knowing the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition's desire to continually have these unanimous consents, I am delighted to have a very brief opportunity to offer my congratulations to all of those who have been elected in this past election, to welcome those who have been re-elected and, more particularly, the new members of this chamber.

I too, sir, on behalf of my party, extend my congratulations to you on your election as Speaker, as our choice to preside over us all, and assure you of our commitment for support of your initiative, which also has been espoused by the Premier on a number of occasions, to enhance the image of this Legislature.

I extend to the Premier on this very special day my congratulations for his right to truly lead this province in the direction that he should set, in appreciation for how difficult it is after the last five years of how this province has been governed, and the complete co-operation of my party in ensuring that the best is done for the people of this province.

Hon Mr Rae: I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party for their declarations of support, which I have noted, on all reasonable occasions.

I want to congratulate you, sir, on your election as Speaker, and say to all members, whether they are new or re-elected, that we are very much aware of the task ahead of us. We are also aware of the fact that we are elected to do a job and to represent our constituents and to present the positions of our parties, and that is as it should be. But I want to say that as little as I expected to be sitting and standing in this particular place at this particular time, if indeed ever, I look forward very much to the responsibility, to the co-operation and to the goodwill of all the members of the House.

J'aimerais remercier tous les députés. Je veux vous féliciter, Monsieur le Président, pour votre élection et j'anticipe beaucoup, naturellement, le bon travail qui nous attend et qui attend toute la population de la province. Merci beaucoup.

The Speaker: Mr Speaker thanks you for your kind words and is looking forward to a continuation of the same atmosphere tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1546.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS
(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Tuesday 20 November 1990

Speech from the throne	Other business
His Honour the Lieutenant Governor 2099	Leader of the opposition 2103
	The Speaker
First readings	Roll of members elected 2103
	The Speaker
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 1 2103	Adjournment motion 2103
Ms Wark-Martyn	Ms Martel
Agreed to 2103	Mr Nixon
	Mr Harris
Motion	Mr Rae
	Agreed to 2103
	Adjournment 2103
Throne speech debate 2103	Lists of members
Ms Martel	
Agreed to 2103	Members and their responsibilities 2104

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 20 novembre 1990

Discours du trône	Divers
Son Honneur le lieutenant-gouverneur 2199	Motion en vue d'adjourner 2103
	M. Rae

CA20N
X1
-323



57 1990

57 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 21 November 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 21 novembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938. Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 21 November 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

The Speaker: I would like to ask all members to join me in welcoming the first group of pages to serve in the first session of the 35th Parliament:

Luciana Cacciaccaro, Etobicoke-Lakeshore; Laura Cricket, Carleton; Ryan Fortner, Welland-Thorold; Brian Fulsom, Nepean; Andrew Imrie, Peterborough; Megan Kerford, Durham-York; Elizabeth Kohli, Halton Centre; Renuga Kugadass, Lawrence; Sophie Lafrance, Nickel Belt; Jussi Leinala, Sudbury East; Anthony MacDonald, London North; Kristen MacKay, Halton North; Katie May, Middlesex; Rikin Morzaria, Markham; Meaghan Obee, Victoria-Haliburton; Kola Owolabi, Scarborough East; Aden Seaton, Lanark-Renfrew; Sarika Shah, Cornwall; Paul Sharp, Ottawa Centre; Carolyn Sparrey, York East; Jerry Stack, Huron; Matthew Stone, Simcoe East; Cary Wildman, Algoma; Michael Wood, Elgin.

Hon Miss Martel: I would like to ask the unanimous consent of all members of the House to move a motion with respect to permitting personal assistants on the floor of the House to assist members who have disabilities, in order that they might participate in these proceedings. Is that agreed?

The Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Agreed to.

MOTION

ASSISTANTS FOR DISABLED MEMBERS

Miss Martel moved that, notwithstanding any standing order or custom of Parliament, personal assistants be permitted on the floor of the House and in committees to assist members with disabilities to participate in the proceedings of the House.

Hon Miss Martel: This is in order to accommodate the member for York East (Mr Malkowski) and any other members who in future may be elected to this Legislature who would need those assistants.

Mr Elston: I wish to make a comment if I might on that motion. My comments will come as no surprise to either the government House leader or yourself, because I have spoken to both of you about the position that we have with respect to this particular motion. We will not hold it up from being passed—I think that would not be rational at all—but I did want to comment that my feeling and the feeling of the caucus here is that this sort of motion need not even be addressed to the floor since we feel that the type of assistance that is required here should

come automatically without such a motion happening in any event.

The idea of this motion being presented is that the people who are here as assistants are strangers to the floor. It is our understanding, on the principles required, that these people are not strangers but are in fact natural and needed extensions of the member elected.

We will not stand in the way of the motion passing, but we just wanted to make the point that philosophically we believe these people should be here as of right and not by exemption.

Hon Miss Martel: I agree entirely with the statement that was raised by the House leader for the official opposition. I raised those concerns with the Clerk and the table officers before the House leaders even met with respect to this position. Unfortunately, I could not get any of them on side and we decided the best thing to do to cover all cases in future was to move a motion that was as broad as possible, which would allow not only the accommodation of the member for York East but any other member who might come to this House and require other assistance, not only with respect to interpreters but perhaps if we have a member who is blind who might need some assistance. So we have tried to make the best of the situation by putting forward a motion which will cover all possible circumstances in future.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

Mr Chiarelli: First, Mr Speaker, let me congratulate you on your re-election to the House and your election as Speaker. We wish you great success.

Later today, I will be introducing a bill requiring the election at large of Ottawa-Carleton's regional chairman. The overwhelming majority of Ottawa-Carleton residents see the election at large of the chairman as the single best way to make regional government more accountable.

Earlier this year, our government responded to the accountability issue by introducing comprehensive reforms based on the recommendations of the Bartlett commission. The new government will need to review the Bartlett recommendations and develop its own policies on regional government reform. However, by passing this bill now, a strong measure of accountability will be in place while other more substantive reforms are worked out.

The bill also caps campaign donations and expenses for the election of the regional chairman. I am therefore urging the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the member for Ottawa Centre to support and pass this bill before

Christmas in order that it be in place for the 1991 municipal elections.

1340

RECYCLING WEEK

Mr Cousens: This week has been notable in many ways. We in Ontario were the first provincial jurisdiction in Canada to elect a Speaker to our Legislature. We received the first speech from the throne from the New Democratic government and, remarkably, we have witnessed one of the greatest transformations of a political party. It would now seem that our social democratic friends across the floor are not Liberals in a hurry after all.

I would like to remind all members of this House, and indeed the government of the day, that this week is also recycling week in the province of Ontario. Yesterday's speech from the throne was an excellent opportunity for this government to unveil its plans for reducing, reusing and recycling our solid waste. Our party feels that addressing Ontario's waste crisis is an urgent priority. Some interesting statistics from the Recycling Advisory Committee include: 19 trees can be saved by recycling one tonne of newspapers; every tonne of steel cans recycled saves 1.5 tonnes of iron ore and 3.6 barrels of oil; recycling one tonne of waste can save three cubic yards of landfill space.

While every effort must be made by all of us to reduce and reuse as much as possible, recycling continues to play an important role in resolving the crisis before us. I say to the minister: Action must be taken immediately. We have not a moment to waste. The future is ours. Reduce, reuse and recycle.

DAVID REVILLE

Ms Churley: I would like to say a few words about my predecessor in this House, the member for Riverdale, David Reville.

David was first drawn into politics through his close involvement with the community. As a member of Toronto city council, he was a driving force behind establishing neighbourhood legal services.

David was also instrumental in helping to mobilize community opposition to a proposed garbage incinerator in south Riverdale and convincing city council to fund the intervenors. Thus was born Citizens for a Safe Environment.

When he was elected to the Ontario Legislature in 1985, David honoured both his predecessor, the late Jim Renwick, and the environmentally concerned citizens of Riverdale by demanding, in the first question he asked in this Legislature, that the Minister of the Environment begin a lead cleanup in Riverdale. The minister, to his credit, took David's advice.

In 1987, David was successful in convincing members of this Legislature to adopt a number of amendments to the Mental Health Act. The passage of Bill 190 made the Ontario Mental Health Act the most progressive in Canada.

In closing, I would like to repeat the words of one media observer who said: "David Reville is one of the most decent politicians I've ever met. He has courage."

As some members may know, he also has a sense of humour. I know that I am speaking for all of my colleagues in the Legislature in wishing him well in life outside this chamber. As the member for Riverdale, I will work hard to meet the high standards established by David Reville.

HIGHWAY 17A IN KENORA

Mr Miclash: Before I go into my statement, as well, Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your election to the Chair. I look forward to working with you.

A historic moment occurred in Kenora this past Friday morning. After 13 long years, much debate and a good number of alterations, Highway 17A, an alternative around Kenora, was opened.

For anyone who has driven through the town, he will know what a bottleneck in the Trans-Canada Highway Kenora's main street was. During the opening, I was able to refer to a number of very tragic mishaps that occurred on the congested streets in Kenora. I am happy to report to the House today that with the opening of 17A, these will be eliminated.

However, the project is not yet complete. The former government, at the wishes of the residents and businesses of the Kenora area, agreed to a number of changes in the design of the entrances and exits of the new route. I cannot stress the importance of these alterations enough. They are desperately needed to ensure safe passage on to and off 17A.

A commitment to ensure this safe passage was made by the former government in the way of the beginning of the construction of the same immediately upon the opening of 17A.

At this time, I would like to stress the importance of these and suggest that both the ministers of Transportation and Northern Development do everything in their power to ensure the completion of these projects in a timely manner.

HEALTH CARE

Mr J. Wilson: Yesterday's speech from the throne was conspicuous in its avoidance of health care issues. In light of this vagueness, my statement is directed to the Minister of Health, and it concerns two hospitals in my riding of Simcoe West.

Not only is Collingwood's economy suffering, but the town's hospital is awaiting the government's commitment to fund a desperately needed redevelopment of its facility. The hospital is looking for two-thirds support for the estimated \$15-million redevelopment project. Currently, the hospital foundation has collected donations worth \$2 million and has pledged for an additional \$2 million.

There is an extreme need for this redevelopment. On a busy ski weekend, the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital receives about 150 visits to its emergency ward. During the course of the year, the overcrowded emergency

department will handle some 37,000 visits. The minister should be aware that this figure falls just below the number of visits to the emergency ward at Toronto General.

In addition, a sizeable portion of the hospital was built in 1895 and upgrading is urgently needed.

Stevenson Memorial Hospital in Alliston is carrying a deficit for the first time in its history. The hospital's deficit is the direct result of the previous government's imposition of pay equity, the employer health tax levy and lost revenue from OHIP.

What does the government expect hospitals such as the one in Alliston to do to offset these costs? The throne speech provided no answers, which leads to the obvious conclusion that the ministry expects community hospitals to continue to cut services and jobs in order to balance budgets.

COMMUNITY LIVING ALTERNATIVES, SCARBOROUGH

Mr Owens: I rise today to make a statement regarding Community Living Alternatives, Scarborough. This group consists of 48 members who are parents of developmentally handicapped adults and adolescents. Community Living Alternatives, Scarborough is a compassionate and dynamic organization that is seeking to provide its adult children with an opportunity to live and participate as important and active members in their community.

This organization is also seeking to reduce the waiting list for group homes for individuals with developmental handicaps. Their first group home opened in September 1989 on Courtlands Drive in Scarborough, and on 14 November of this year, the Honourable Zanana Akande, Minister of Community and Social Services, announced that \$185,090 would be provided annually for operating expenses for a second home in Scarborough.

I was quite pleased to assist this worthy organization in its efforts to gain funding, and I tip my hat to Bill Meldazy and Community Living Alternatives, Scarborough.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

M. Beer : Nous venons de franchir, le 19 novembre, le premier anniversaire de l'entrée en vigueur de la Loi sur les services en français.

J'ai eu l'honneur de présider à la déclaration de cette entrée en vigueur de la Loi, à minuit le 18 novembre dernier. Je n'oublierai jamais la fierté et l'euphorie qui animaient les francophones réunis ce soir-là à Toronto pour célébrer cet événement tant attendu.

Comme le disait si bien la chanson lancée ce soir-là, Notre place, tout ce que les francophones demandent c'est la possibilité de prendre leur place légitime dans la vie de cette province.

Over the last 25 years, successive Ontario governments have expanded the provision of French-language services in the fields of education and justice as well as those offered to the public by government ministries and

agencies. The French Language Services Act remains one of the most important achievements of any Ontario government to serve the province's francophone population. It guarantees the individual's right to receive provincial government services in French in designated areas.

Lors d'une réunion en fin de semaine dernière, les francophones ont annoncé une vaste consultation provinciale sur l'avenir des francophones en Ontario dans le contexte des discussions sur l'avenir de notre pays.

Je voudrais profiter de cette occasion pour leur souhaiter beaucoup de succès dans cet exercice et pour rappeler à tous les députés de cette nouvelle Assemblée législative que nous partageons la responsabilité d'assurer aux francophones l'infrastructure et les conditions équitables, pour qu'ils puissent continuer à enrichir l'Ontario de leur présence et de leur culture.

1350

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr Jordan: I suggest there is nothing new in the throne speech announced on nuclear energy. First and foremost, this government has reneged on a promise to stop Darlington. In the select committee's report on Darlington, the NDP dissenting opinion said, "We believe the construction of Darlington should be stopped and that the plant should, at the very least, be mothballed."

This was their position despite the fact the plant had already cost the Ontario taxpayers \$11 billion. Now the costs have reached \$12.9 billion and the new Premier has changed his mind.

The Premier did not instruct Ontario Hydro to rewrite the 25-year demand/supply plan and take out the proposals for new nuclear facilities. He has also refused to rule out eventually lifting the moratorium and building more nuclear plants if conservation efforts do not succeed. If the Premier was serious about his commitment to eliminate nuclear power in Ontario, he would have done both of these things.

The throne speech also said that the government would instruct Ontario Hydro, which has already earmarked over \$3 billion towards conservation measures over the next decade, to spend another \$240 million, which is less than 1% in that budget. Will it be enough to keep Ontario out of the dark? I ask, what has changed?

NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr Wood: I rise today to praise the government for its commitment to the north in the throne speech. The throne speech is a document of fairness. It is a blueprint for the people of Ontario that will fulfil our election promises based on these tough economic times.

On our native land claims, the aboriginal population in northern Ontario is six times the provincial average and it has been ignored for a long time by the previous regime, which is why I welcome the new government's pledge to make major strides in aboriginal self-government.

Also, over 22% of the population of northern Ontario speak French. Over 60% of the people in my riding of

Cochrane North speak the language as well. That is why I am excited to see from the government a commitment of working to assure the rights of Franco-Ontarians.

Also, Cochrane North is a vast and expansive area spanning some 100,000 square miles where the car is often the only mode of transportation because communities are too far apart from each other. A fair and equitable car insurance system which the government will bring in will ease the cost of owning a car and help consumers.

As well, northern Ontario is the victim of the federal government's destructive and regressive economic and fiscal policies. This lack of action to provide the people of the north with protection during this period of restructuring is, to say the least, intolerable. We will introduce measures to protect the workers and their families from this injustice.

We will also provide a \$700-million fund to spread—

The Speaker: Time.

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have laid upon the table a copy of order-in-council 2215/90 appointing the Speaker as chairperson; the Honourable Shelley Martel; the Honourable Shirley Coppen; the Honourable Gilles Pouliot; Dennis Drainville, MPP; Murray Elston, MPP, and Ernie Eves, MPP, as commissioners to the Board of Internal Economy.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

COURT SYSTEM

Hon Mr Hampton: On 18 October, the Supreme Court of Canada used section 11(b) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to rule that backlogs and delays in the criminal justice system were intolerable, and that the rights of accused, victims and the public to a speedy trial were being denied.

Court backlogs and lengthy systematic delays in many courtrooms in this province, particularly those in the greater Metropolitan area, are not new. Successive provincial governments have allowed the problem to deteriorate over the last several years. Now more than ever government and the key players of the justice system must accept responsibility for the credibility of the criminal court system, and work co-operatively to develop achievable solutions.

To deal with the many challenges created by what has become known as the Askov decision, I acted immediately to put in place several short-term measures. These measures were designed to ensure public safety.

Provincial crown attorneys are making every effort to bring forward serious charges in jeopardy of being dismissed due to unacceptable delays. Certain minor charges which are at risk due to delay and where it is determined they do not compromise public safety are being considered for withdrawal. This is done in an attempt to bring serious cases forward, which might otherwise be lost as a result of delays.

Today I am announcing a government commitment of over \$39 million to reduce delays and backlogs in the criminal court system. The funds, totalling \$10.9 million for the current fiscal year and an additional \$28.3 million for the next fiscal year, will allow for the appointment of 27 new Ontario Court (Provincial Division) judges, and additional assistant crown attorneys and court staff. I have also made a request to my federal counterpart for the appointment of 12 new judges to the Ontario Court (General Division). Detailed announcements regarding the appointment of new judges will be made in the following weeks.

Just as important, the additional funds will help to facilitate the implementation of a number of reforms over the next year and a half. Combined, these measures will reduce time-to-trial delays and allow for the scheduling of all criminal court cases within acceptable time limits. But I want to stress that the new resources alone will not solve the problem. We must also change the way we do business in our courts.

Within the next few months the Ministry of the Attorney General will work with members of the justice system to implement the following initiatives: first, the extension of screening pilot projects to districts receiving staffing through additional resources; second, the reallocation of resources, including assistant crown attorneys, to jurisdictions experiencing the longest delays; third, a province-wide examination of the use of courtrooms to establish innovative ways for utilizing existing court facilities and maximizing court space; fourth, the appointment of four additional members to the Judicial Advisory Appointments Committee to expedite all new judicial appointments.

In addition, the Attorney General has asked Chief Judge Sidney Linden to consider the quick implementation of the following initiatives: first, establishing specialized courts in backlogged areas to expedite the handling of specific classes of charges, such as impaired driving; second, establishing afternoon and evening sittings in jurisdictions where the court backlog situation is most acute.

I am also pleased to announce the establishment of a minister's task force to make recommendations to me regarding specific medium- and long-term measures consistent with the charter to reduce delays and improve efficiency in the criminal court system.

The task force will be composed of a chair and two representatives from the community, with counsel provided by one member of the defence bar and a representative of the provincial crown attorneys. The task force will be responsible for examining and making recommendations related to the improved utilization of resources, future case flow management initiatives, a review of the criminal process and measures to improve co-ordination and planning between federal and provincial justice ministries. It will be established in January and it is to report recommendations within six months.

I recognize the enormous impact the Supreme Court of Canada decision has had for a number of victims of crime. Letters are being sent to individuals affected by the

decision. In addition, letters have been mailed to a number of organizations concerned with victims of crime advising them that senior ministry officials will be available to discuss any concerns they may have.

I am pleased to add today that the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board will undertake a consultative process with representatives of the community and government. They will review current legislation regarding compensation and examine other jurisdictional models to identify alternative ways in which the justice system responds to victims of crime. The process will be determined by the chair of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board and will commence shortly.

My ministry has been consulting with the ministries of Community and Social Services, Correctional Services, the Solicitor General and Municipal Affairs to determine the specific impact reforms will have on the resources of these ministries.

I want to stress again that the success of these efforts lies in the hands of a number of groups. A high quality of justice in our courts and improved service to the public cannot be achieved by the efforts of my ministry alone. It requires the co-operation and commitment of all the players in the justice system. Collectively, we have a significant role to play in the administration of justice.

1400

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Hon Mrs Grier: I do not think I have to tell any member of this Legislature that we have a crisis in waste management in the province. Frankly, I am startled by how little has been achieved to date in terms of real progress in diverting waste from disposal sites.

Today I want to outline the framework of a three-part environmental plan that will be responsible, sensitive and cost-effective and will be developed in consultation with municipalities and environmental groups. I reject the idea of continuing with a waste management system that squanders material resources. My objective is to change Ontario's 1980s consumer way of life into a 1990s conserver society.

The first thing we must do is to get our 3R priorities straight: reduce, then reuse and, finally, recycle. I will be asking people from all parts of the community to help make the 3Rs work effectively.

Right now we have a runaway waste generation. We see it in our homes and schools, in food stores, shopping malls, office towers, restaurants, hotels and hospitals—all the industries, businesses, offices and institutions.

I will be moving quickly to implement a number of waste reduction measures, including: mandatory work plans to reduce waste from major users of packaging to achieve our 25% diversion objective by 1992; prohibitions of valuable resource materials, such as wood and cardboard, at landfills across the province and efforts to develop markets for them; separation at source of materials for recycling at industrial, commercial and institutional sites which generate waste.

To help create a conserver society there will be seed money for new ideas and initiatives in industrial, commercial and institutional 3Rs programs; increased education so that people can make better use of their blue boxes and other reduction systems such as composting; more funding to improve and expand municipal programs in waste reduction, reuse and recycling, and a review of all provincial policies so that we discourage waste and provide incentives for reducing garbage.

As a second major action plan, my government will introduce changes to the environmental assessment process. While we fully support the values and principles that underlie the act, it has not always worked in the best interests of all concerned. The current act is frustrating, time-consuming and costly. To get the changes to the process under way, I will be releasing a discussion document on the Environmental Assessment Act which was prepared by the previous government. I will of course be consulting broadly to ensure the final development of an environmentally sensitive, timely and cost-effective process.

Reducing waste and improving the environmental assessment process will, in the long term, benefit the entire province. However, we have an immediate problem to deal with—the greater Toronto area's waste crisis. I appreciate the effort of the regional chairs and other members of the Solid Waste Interim Steering Committee to date and I look forward to working with them in the future.

Unfortunately, the process designed by the previous government to solve this problem is not working fast enough. Neither is it environmentally sound. As a third part of my plan, and to help us tackle this particular problem effectively, I intend to establish a new public sector authority. This authority will work as a co-operative venture between the province and the regional municipalities in the greater Toronto area. I will assign responsibility to the authority to search for and select a waste disposal site. This site will be subject to approval under the revised Environmental Assessment Act. This search will begin immediately and be sensitive to the reality of the time constraints involved.

Given the problems of the past process and my commitment to a new solution, I am today suspending the Environmental Assessment Act exemptions for the Whitevale and Brampton sites.

With dramatic improvements in the 3R programs and positive changes to the environmental assessment process, I am persuaded that contingency sites will not be necessary.

It would, of course, be irresponsible of me to take risks with public health and safety. I will continue to monitor progress on waste reduction and on the search for a new site to determine if additional capacity is needed prior to the new site coming on stream.

To be prepared for any emergency, I will now ask Metropolitan Toronto and the region of Peel to delay final closing of the three existing sites so that if they are needed in an emergency they can be reopened easily.

It is clear that there are no quick and easy solutions. Full co-operation and an all-out effort to achieve a healthier society is needed from everyone: provincial and municipal governments, industries, businesses, institutions, labour, community and environmental groups, and individuals, and, of course, I know I can rely on the support of all members of this House.

ANTI-DRUG STRATEGIES

Hon Mr Farnan: It gives me great pleasure to draw the honourable members' attention to the fact that this is Drug Awareness Week in Ontario. As my colleagues will know, Drug Awareness Week is an annual event sponsored by this government and the federal government to promote public awareness of alcohol and drug issues and to draw attention to the activities of literally thousands of local community organizations which work in the addictions field in prevention, treatment and enforcement.

The kind of public attention Drug Awareness Week is intended to foster is not the kind generated by alarmist headlines, nor a vague knowledge that some people somewhere are involved with drugs or are addicted. It is a deeper kind of understanding we all seek—an awareness of how drug experimentation and addiction can affect community life, an awareness of how drugs can sap the energy and skew the judgement of users, and an awareness of how drug activity can interfere with the enjoyment of our streets, homes and parks.

Drug Awareness Week is a catalyst for this kind of understanding and recognition of the roles of individuals working together in fighting substance abuse.

Our government, through the Provincial Anti-Drug Secretariat, has been able to assist local Drug Awareness Week activities. We have done this through support for the provincial co-ordinating committee and 21 local Drug Awareness Week projects throughout the province.

Our government's support has enabled local groups to undertake a wide variety of exciting projects, including the promotion of drug-free lifestyles through miniconferences, supper meetings, community forums, workplace wellness programs, mall displays and public service announcements. Young people are being encouraged to address drug and substance abuse issues and build leadership skills around student-oriented prevention projects. They are introducing videos and plays to inform students of the dangers of drug dependency. There are many programs to help communities become drug-resistant—programs aimed at the young, single mothers, members of high-risk groups and children.

I am sure this will provide my honourable colleagues with a sense of the range of activities under way in their local communities throughout the province during this week.

All of our efforts, both during Drug Awareness Week and the other 51 weeks of the year, are designed to empower individuals and groups to take action. We are committed to building a drug-free Ontario through supporting both individual and collective action—action on an individual, group, community and province-wide basis.

Our second focus is on consultation. The anti-drug secretariat is currently involved in a series of consultative youth forums aimed directly at young people in high schools, asking them for their views and solutions to drug and alcohol abuse. This form of direct consultation will be a hallmark of our activities over the months and years ahead.

This government is committed to moving from awareness to action. We are building an anti-drug movement in the province of Ontario through individual and community consultation and empowerment.

I am proud to be part of this week as its honorary chairman and I am proud of all those who have been working so long to support this goal. I am proud of those who are joining us to build this drug-free movement.

I encourage all members of the House to support the anti-drug efforts being made in their communities.

1410

RESPONSES

COURT SYSTEM

Mr Sorbara: Mr Speaker, I want to begin by congratulating you on your own election to the Chair and all the members, particularly the new members, who have been elected, the members of all three of the parties and our one independent member in the Legislature.

I wish I could congratulate the Attorney General on the first statement that he has made in this 35th Parliament. It is interesting that on the day that he makes the statement, the same day that the new Minister of the Environment makes the statement about recycling and reuse, in our request to have one copy of his statement sent over we received not only three copies, but two of them in these very glossy folders, which really are not necessary for statements any more. We just need a copy of the statement typed out as the minister reads it.

What is more unfortunate is what was contained in the statement itself. The Attorney General, in a sort of classic model, having encountered a problem in court delays, has simply thrown money at the problem. He knows clearly, and it has been reported in a number of reports, that the problem is management. He suggests that now an additional \$10 million is to be available to hire new judges, when Mr Justice Zuber reported that the in-court time that judges are spending in courtrooms right now is only between two and a half and three and a half hours per day. It is a management problem and the minister knows it but he needs something more dramatic, so he has announced the expenditure of more money when this province does not have the luxury of spending that kind of money.

I implore the Attorney General to do one thing and one thing only during the life of this Parliament, and that is, every time that his government introduces a piece of legislation that has penal provisions in it where our courtrooms are going to be expanded in terms of their case load, I wish he would make sure that within each announcement of new legislation he has provisions to expand our courts so that this problem will never arise again.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mrs Sullivan: As I start my response, I would like to extend my congratulations to the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore on assuming the position of Minister of the Environment. We have worked in the past on the select committee on energy and we are certainly looking forward to some interesting activity from her as minister.

I must say that I was surprised and in fact disappointed that the minister began her statement today by indicating that she was startled by how little had been achieved in terms of real progress. In fact, I was startled by how little was put forward in this statement to deal with what she has described already as a crisis in waste management.

We have, as members know, welcomed the 3Rs emphasis, and indeed many of the positions that have been put forward in this statement follow simply on the initiatives that were introduced by the former Minister of the Environment, the member for St Catharines.

Looking in particular at the 25% diversion from landfill by 1992 and the 50% diversion by 2000, these are, as has been pointed out, ambitious targets. Referring to the greater Toronto area, what those targets mean is that by 1992 we will be looking to divert substantially more than a million tonnes of municipal solid waste from landfill, and we have to be honest when we are looking at that diversion about the 50% of waste material which will not be diverted. It must be landfilled or used in an integrated strategy that includes energy recovery from landfill or other environmentally acceptable methods.

We have seen in this statement some direction relating to mandatory work plans to reduce waste. We do not know how this fits into the national packaging protocol. We do not see how this is going to meet their targets of 80% reduction in 1988 levels. We do not see who pays for them, who does them and what the plans are. On the bans at landfill, we do not see any market development support for those materials.

Relating to the greater Toronto area initiative, replacement of the solid waste interim steering committee, SWISC, this is an absolute copout. At no time was there an integrated waste management strategy dealing with those issues. We see a new approach relating to landfill only; we see no integrated waste management; we see no recycling plans there; we see no place for the garbage to go when landfill runs out in Peel in one year. This is simply inadequate.

COURT SYSTEM

Mr Harnick: May I congratulate the Attorney General for doing what was totally obvious and for doing as well what his predecessor would not do—and I mean his immediate predecessor—despite advice from courts, from bar associations, from advocate societies and from the Criminal Lawyers Association.

My concern when we spend \$39 million is that we spend it so we get a quality system of justice. I would ask the Attorney General to please ensure that provincial court judges are paid on the same basis as federal court

judges, that crown attorneys are paid properly so that every three years they do not leave the system and leave it in disarray.

I would also ask the Attorney General to please acknowledge victims' rights with a bill of victims' rights, which he was in favour of when he sat on this side of the House and which I would ask him to please consider again.

As well, I would ask the minister to consider the reforms of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, reforms that have been studied and studied and do not need to be studied again. The benefits that that board pays are benefits that are, in a word, cheap.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr Cousens: Last week the Minister of the Environment did not realize there was a crisis, or at least would not admit it to the Metropolitan Toronto councillors and chairman, but at last—and I congratulate her—she has at least begun to put in writing, in this House and on the record, that there is a crisis and now she is going to begin to deal with it.

If she is going to consult, as she indicates in her statement today, let's hope it is not the kind of consulting that the Liberals did for the last few years, because they use the same words, but when you talked about consulting, they went and did it after the fact. You never knew ahead of time what they were going to do. They would do something and say, "Hey, we consulted." That was not consulting. We want to see real consulting going on. That means—

Interjections.

Mr Cousens: It is not over for you guys. The fact is, we are talking—

Interjection.

The Speaker: Would the honourable member take his seat, please. This was after yesterday, when you all promised to come back and behave just like you did yesterday, from all sides. If you will do the member the courtesy of listening to him, then I will add the additional 30 seconds and the member may pick up where he left off.

Mr Cousens: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I think you are going to have a tough time with these Liberals.

We also acknowledge the fact that the minister wants to deal with this runaway waste generation and her reference to involving industry and business in the solution. When you think that some 60% of the waste generation comes from that part of our society, then we really have to involve them in helping solve it. It has been neglected until now. Let's begin to involve all parties in seeking out the solution.

When the minister refers to the changes in the environmental assessment process, I want to thank her to listening to our leader, the member for Nipissing. That was the first thing he said in the election campaign, that

changes had to be made there. The fact that the minister is beginning to start that process is very much in line with what our leader, the leader of the Progressive Conservatives, talked about in the early parts of the campaign. When the minister talks about dollars for the municipalities, let's hope she puts in enough dollars to make it happen. We are dealing with time; we are dealing with constraints of money as well.

1420

ANTI-DRUG STRATEGIES

Mr Carr: I am glad to see that this Solicitor General has finally recognized the importance of the epidemic that is out there. The Addiction Research Foundation estimates that the toll of drug abuse is at about \$9 billion. I would like, as the people of the province would like, to ask where this was yesterday and how we can take this commitment seriously in light of the fact that there was not one mention of it yesterday in the throne speech.

The NDP speech on drug awareness is noticeably lacking in hard action. When in opposition the Solicitor General strongly urged more support for the police, and now that they are in government we see that there is nothing more than a lot of hot air.

When you look at the statistics and see the \$9 billion, when you see that 80% of crimes are drug related, you see the urgency. I am glad that, even if it is one day late, we are starting to address that problem. I urge the Solicitor General to present his plan to combat this drug problem as soon as possible.

ORAL QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT STRATEGIES

Mr Nixon: My question is directed to the Premier and it has to do with the announcement yesterday in the throne speech on the relocation of government offices.

We are aware of the reluctance expressed by the Premier and his colleagues up until the announcement yesterday. I am really asking for clarification as to whether the former government's policy of the relocation of 6,000 permanent, recession-proof jobs out of Toronto is really an indication of what the government has in mind.

Hon Mr Rae: Mr Speaker, I hope this is permissible under the rules. I would like to answer the first question. If there are supplementaries which go into detail, I am going to refer them to the Minister of Government Services because she is familiar with that.

I would like to simply answer the former Treasurer by saying that the commitment of this government, the decision of this government is to proceed with the over 5,000 jobs, as I recall the number, which were announced by his government prior to 1990.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: I have difficulty with those words—which were announced by the Liberal government prior to 6 September. That is the intention of our government.

Mr Nixon: If the Premier has directed it to the Minister of Government Services, that is quite appropriate as far as I am concerned.

Although the statement in the throne speech yesterday was of a rather general nature, indicating the policy would go forward only after consultation and approval from the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, with which I understand the minister has previous connections, would it be possible for her to say why, even before the speech was read, she or her officials were contacting a variety of municipal leaders by fax and by telephone, giving them the good news that they were going to be the recipients of an established Liberal policy?

Hon Ms Lankin: As the Premier has indicated, the decision was made to go ahead with the relocations as had been announced by the previous government. The instructions I gave to my staff were to send faxes to the mayors of those cities to inform them of that decision as the throne speech was being read yesterday. We felt it was very important to try to end the uncertainty that existed in those communities.

I am sure many of the members who represent those communities on all sides of the House here have spoken with their municipal council representatives and their mayors and have had a sense of the uncertainty and anxiety that existed. We wanted to inform them at the same time as the throne speech was being read.

Mr Nixon: I have a report on the relocation announcements for summer 1990, which is a policy and priorities board of cabinet document which I understand was in the press in Windsor and Hamilton yesterday. The indications were that the recommendations to the ministry and to the policy and priorities board were that this phase-in be over 10 years as a possibility and that certain communities not be involved.

It is not clear, since the honourable minister did not make the announcement in the House but only directly to the municipalities concerned, which ones were fortunate enough to be a part of the New Democratic Party government policy.

Certainly the Premier indicated that 5,000 jobs would be involved, but I am not sure that the communities of Brantford, St Catharines, Cornwall, Elliot Lake and other communities desperately in need of these permanent recession-proof jobs have been informed.

Will the minister explain to the House and to the communities concerned how she and her colleagues picked the communities to be informed and what the timetable is going to be in using this, not as a new government policy which itself is important but to allay in some degree the depredations of the recession in these communities where it is of such importance?

Hon Ms Lankin: The announcements which the previous government made prior to the election are what we are carrying through with. Those jobs will be moved to all of the communities that in fact had been listed in the announcements. The letters that were sent to the mayors yesterday, the letters that I signed, were to all of those

communities that the member listed: Haileybury, Windsor, St Catharines. The number of jobs and the ministries to be moved in fact are the same as what had been announced previously.

I do want to say that with respect to the community of St Catharines, in the letter that I sent to the mayor of St Catharines and copied to the regional chairman, we did indicate that the Ministry of Government Services would undertake a consultation with them in their community with respect to the location of the building of the Ministry of Transportation headquarters that we locate there, keeping in mind environmental concerns, agricultural food lands, preservation of the tender fruit lands and the goals and stated direction of the official regional plan. We will undertake that communication. The intention is to move the headquarters and all of the jobs to that area. The actual location of the building will be as a result of the consultation that will take place.

With respect to the time frame, let me just say that we did look at whether or not it would make sense to extend the time frame over 10 years. We decided to proceed with the seven-year time frame that the previous government announced.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr Nixon: I have a question to the Premier. Is it possible that he can dispel any uncertainty regarding yesterday's announced nuclear moratorium by confirming now in the House his signed election response on 14 August 1990 to five environmental groups that committed him and his government that no new nuclear reactors will be built in Ontario and that our nuclear capability will be phased out?

Hon Mr Rae: Let me answer the Treasurer—the Leader of the Opposition. These habits die hard. Let me answer the Leader of the Opposition as directly as I can. The statement yesterday made it very clear. First of all, we are completing the Darlington project for the simple reason that so much money has been committed to that project some five years after 1985 that we think that is the responsible thing to do.

We have also stated very clearly and directed to Ontario Hydro that the work that was started under the Liberal government plan with respect to an expansion of nuclear power in which Hydro was authorized to spend hundreds of millions of dollars with respect to pre-engineering and site planning for new nuclear plants be stopped. We have directed that those funds, as an alternative, should be directed towards energy efficiency and conservation.

That is what we have done. That is the nature of the moratorium. At the same time, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, the Environmental Assessment Board is going to be considering a range of plans from Hydro as well as the submissions of dozens of intervenors over the next few years with respect to what the future is going to look like. We think we can change the picture with respect to load growth and with respect to demand if we put the effort that was being put into the construction of

new nuclear plants into energy efficiency and conservation. That is our belief and that is the nature of the moratorium we have established.

1430

Mr Nixon: Directly arising from the Premier's answer, it is my understanding from his comments that the moratorium is therefore directed only to Hydro and any reviews or planning it is presently undertaking, and under his orders that will be stopped. Am I also to understand, however, that the environmental assessment on the load growth proposal from Hydro continues unchanged, with the understanding that a major part of the proposals calls for substantial nuclear development in the next 25 years?

Hon Mr Rae: Let me be clear that as I understand the process, and I think I have understood it correctly, the Environmental Assessment Board is seized essentially of two questions. The first is, what is the demand going to be over the next 25 years? What is that load growth going to be over the next 25 years? If I may say so, that is a subject of considerable debate, because obviously it depends on how successful we are with respect to energy efficiency and conservation. That is why we as a government attach such importance to the directions we have given to Ontario Hydro, and that is to say: "Look, don't skew the Environmental Assessment Board hearings towards nuclear by simply proceeding with your own nuclear pre-engineering work. Give energy efficiency and conservation a chance—a chance to be made to work and a chance to show how we can deal with load growth."

It is fair to say that Ontario Hydro is going to be presenting a range of options, including a non-nuclear option, to the Environmental Assessment Board, and it is also clear that intervenors from across the board are also going to be making those suggestions.

I also want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that our government has another obligation of which we are very much aware, and that obligation is to ensure a steady supply of affordable energy to the people of this province. That is an obligation we take very seriously. We think it is completely compatible with efficiency, and that is what we intend to carry out.

Mr Nixon: Would it be correct to say then that it is entirely in the hands of the electricity consumers? The Premier has indicated that it is his policy to maintain an adequate supply of electricity. If the consumers in fact want to use more than he would hope, then it is their decision, not his, and if it has to be provided from a nuclear source, then so be it. Is that the nature of the moratorium?

Is it possible that after the independent environmental assessment experts, with the full range of expertise available to them, indicate to the Premier, or to his successor three years from now or eight years from now when the environmental assessment may have been completed, that without a nuclear capability something in the reduction of the availability of power must occur, then it would be his

view to give further consideration to the development of nuclear generation?

Hon Mr Rae: Again, I appreciate the question and I also appreciate the spirit with which it has been offered.

Let me say to the Leader of the Opposition that, first of all, some consumers of electricity can also be generators of electricity. Nuclear generation is not the only way for energy and electricity to be produced in this province. That is a fact. If the former Treasurer is saying that the only way the Liberal Party can think of generating electricity or of saving demand is by going nuclear, I say he is out of step with the facts of life with respect to this situation.

It is the position of the government that we have to make the best and most imaginative and creative effort we can to save energy and to make our system more efficient. We know that there are countries around the world that are doing things more efficiently than we are. We think it is time we started doing things more efficiently here. We believe that this is the option we want to see given a fair chance during the life of this government.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr Harris: I have listened to the opening question and the opening response. I do not know what has changed here since 6 September. I have a question for the Premier.

It has been over two and a half months since the election. During this time the Premier has had an opportunity to receive briefings from the civil service. He has had a chance to review the circumstances of the province. He has been forced or has seen fit to reverse some of his previous commitments, whether it is nuclear generation or Varity or others.

It is in this context that the Premier and I know, and talked about during the campaign, that people today are looking for more openness, more honesty from their politicians. I would like to know if the Premier would share with us today what other election commitments he may have to drop as a result of the briefings and the new understanding of the situation as he understands it today.

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the question. I can say directly to the leader of the Conservative Party that if has specific questions he would like to ask about specific things, either with respect to the Agenda for People or with respect to the speech from the throne, I would be more than pleased to answer them. I look forward to doing so. That is the way in which I prefer to proceed.

Mr Harris: Well, the Premier may not have had enough time; I do not know. I want to say, in the context of this question and in a very serious way, that I think we are dealing with a serious situation across this province with the respect that politicians are held or not held in. I also want the Premier to realize that I am not criticizing him for changing his mind on a number of issues. I think we all know what they are.

Specifically, today I am trying to probe what commitment the Premier now has to some of the specific policies.

He wants me to be specific. There is the minimum coporation tax, the 60% funding for school boards, the speculation tax, extending GO Transit to Peterborough and Brantford, increased support to the Toronto Transit Commission, 100% funding for child care facilities in Metropolitan Toronto, four-laning of northern highways.

So there are some, if the Premier wishes some specifics, but he is the one who knows. He has assessed the situation. Nobody will criticize him for the mess he has inherited. Nobody will criticize him for being honest. But I will be critical, and the public should be critical, if he does not level with us. Will he be dropping his commitment to some of those I have mentioned? Are there others? If so, which ones does he now realize are totally unrealistic and cannot be met? I think this is important.

Hon Mr Rae: I agree it is important. If the leader of the third party would like me to level with him, I would like him to level with me and ask a question that is not entirely rhetorical in nature. He mentioned several. He mentioned a great many. I would be happy to answer them as best I can in the time available. We have made very clear that decisions with respect to individual tax items, as the leader of the third party well knows, are made at the time of the budget. The budget will be coming down in the spring, as we have made very clear.

We have also made very clear that there are commitments we have made that are things we can do right away. There are other things that are going to take more time, over the life of the government. Some of the things he has mentioned, I can say to the leader of the third party, are going to be made very clear in announcements by ministers very, very soon. Others, frankly, are going to take a little bit more time.

I am quite happy to level with the leader as best I can in the circumstances we face, and I am not blaming anybody for those circumstances. We are in a recession. We are going to do what we can with the means with which we have been provided. We have made as clear as we can in the throne speech those areas in which we are going to move right away. We are also making clear that there are some things that are going to take a little more time and we are going to do the very best we can to live up to the commitments we have made as a government.

1440

Mr Harris: I think that if we go back to the campaign, the Agenda for People, the Premier will recall my message was that we could not make any commitments until we saw the books. I said we did not want to raise any new taxes. I admitted there would be some very tough decisions that would have to be made, and the Premier is finding that out.

In the Toronto Star on 13 August, the then leader of the NDP, now Premier, said, "I really think people are fed up with politicians making promises they can't keep." What will add to the cynicism and to the distrust of all of us is not levelling with people as soon as he realized that promises cannot be kept. Are there any others than what we have heard about? Is there one? The Premier must surely have assessed the situation as opposed to announcing

them when the deadline comes for them. Are there any others, one or more, that he can disclose to us today as soon as he is aware of them?

Hon Mr Rae: I think we have already indicated that as soon as we are aware of circumstances which lead—

Mr Elston: Who? We were aware.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: Well, there have been comments that have been made here with respect to the Consumers' Gas issue. I made that very clear. If the members want to ask a question on why we decided to move ahead with the British Gas proposal, I think it was, in the circumstances, the best possible deal we could get for the people of the province.

I say to the leader of the third party that we are going to do the best we can. I think the throne speech indicated clearly the directions in which we are going to move. We have indicated what it is we are going to try to do as a government. We have tried to be as clear as we can. We do not have all the money in the world. We are doing the best we can. If the member has specific questions with respect to specific issues that he wants to put forward with respect to what we are going to do, I would be more than pleased to try to answer them.

Mr Harris: I gave him six. He did not respond. I asked him to name one that he was not planning at this time to keep and he did not give us one, so I am assuming he plans to keep all the rest. We will be watching, I assure him.

INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO

Mr Harris: My second question is for the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could show me in this throne speech document that was read yesterday one thing that would entice a business person from Europe or the Far East or from anywhere to invest or locate a new venture and thus create jobs in Ontario.

Hon Mr Rae: In my discussions with business people about the province—I have had discussions with business people here, I have had discussions with business people in New York, I have been visited by people from Japan and from other countries—basically what they are looking for is a quality of life, a workforce that is going to give them the kind of leadership they are looking for. They are looking for a truly competitive economy in the sense that they look to the nature of the workforce, they look to the quality of the education system, they look to the focus with which government is prepared to sit down and work with them in partnership.

That is what it is that leads them to say that this going to be a good place for them to invest, and these are the kinds of decisions that are being made every day by business people. These are the things we have to look for.

I think that has got to be the direction in which Ontario goes in terms of increasing its competitiveness. That is the way for us to proceed. That is the way we are intending to proceed as a government. Again, I think we

are doing this in a difficult time in terms of recession because many business people are not investing anywhere at all right now. It is that climate we are trying to turn around. We are indicating that we are prepared to stimulate the economy at a time when few other governments are prepared to show that leadership and we are prepared to work in partnership with them in that regard.

Mr Harris: The throne speech document states, "Recessions hurt people." Presumably the major reason a recession hurts people is because people lose their jobs.

Again, I would ask the Premier, where in this throne speech is there anything that would encourage new investment to locate in Ontario, thereby creating the jobs to help get Ontario out of this recession?

Hon Mr Rae: We have shown our confidence in the economy by saying that right away we are going to invest \$700 million in this province. I was encouraged today to listen to the mayor of Toronto on the radio saying that if the province was willing to put in \$700 million, then a lot of municipalities are going to want to come on board in order to join that because they realize that there is work there.

That is as positive a message as we can send. Frankly, what I have been trying to do as leader of the government is to talk personally to business people, to talk extensively with all the people of the province and to tell them very directly that this province is a place where we want business to grow, but where we also want business to be fair. I think that is the modern way to do business and that is how this government intends to do business in the 1990s.

Mr Harris: The \$700-million announcement says that in spite of the fact that we are \$2.5-billion in the hole, we are going to go another \$700 million in the hole. The Premier has now told me that municipalities will spend. That will presumably create increased property taxation.

What I am interested in is to find out whether there will be one private sector job left in this province after a certain point in time. I am not interested in the government jobs at this particular point.

The throne speech contains absolutely nothing that admits that Ontario is not a competitive jurisdiction to locate a business in. It contains no commitments for attracting new business to Ontario. It contains no plans for long-term, private sector job creation or maintaining private sector jobs that are there.

I would like to know if the Premier could tell us whether he believes that the jobs we need to get this province out of the current recession are going to come completely from the public sector, or, if he thinks they are going to come from the private sector, what in the throne speech is going to encourage that?

Hon Mr Rae: I believe in a partnership. I think there are local businessmen in North Bay who are going to benefit from the fact that this government is going to be investing in North Bay. I cannot believe that the leader of the third party really believes that it is going to be bad for contractors, that it is going to be bad for small business, that it is going to be bad for other people who depend on

a good infrastructure in terms of attracting other investment, that it is really going to be bad.

I would say to the leader of the third party that if he sees a world in which people do not work in partnership, then that is not my definition of the world. High interest rates make it difficult. The high dollar makes it difficult. When I talk to business people, those are the two things that they point to in terms of world conditions, in terms of Canada's attractiveness as a place to invest, which right now are making it tough.

But if he is attempting to say that there is somehow going to be a never-ending conflict between the notion of public investment and the private sector, I do not share that view. We cannot grow without the private sector and, if I may say so, the private sector depends as well on a good education system, on an intelligent approach to labour relations and on a co-operative approach to skills training. We all depend on a good public sector and public investment as much as we depend on private investment. The two have to go together and that is our approach.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mrs McLeod: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. A great many people who were expecting to hear from a social reform government were very disappointed yesterday. Certainly, those people who are involved in a fight against poverty had a particular reason to believe and to expect that they would see more in that throne speech than simply a vague pledge to continue to reform Ontario's social assistance system.

I want the minister to know that we are fully supportive of reform of the social assistance system. It was a Liberal government that brought in the Blueprint for Reform. But it is a sad reality that we all recognize that in recent months the recession has swallowed up the very real gains that the Liberal government initiatives were able to achieve, and right now the welfare rolls across this province are soaring. The increased demand for food banks is making it an almost impossible situation to respond to. The people on welfare, the people who are using the food banks, these are the people who really are directly affected by this recession.

I know that the minister knows this situation is urgent. I know that she knows there are people out there who are struggling, that there are children who are hungry, and I know that she knows it is not enough simply to talk about what will be done in the life of this government. Will the minister please tell us what she is going to do tomorrow?

1450

Hon Mrs Akande: I am very happy to answer this question, and I am happy too to hear that the member is interested in what we are going to do about poverty.

This government has indeed inherited not a happy package. Poverty sits prime in our focus and we are going to deal with it interministerially. We are not going to look for one single answer from one single minister and from one single ministry. We are looking at the causes of poverty. We are looking at certainly making sure that people have an adequate income, and that is people

throughout, whether that has to be addressed through minimum wage or if it has to be addressed through an increase in social assistance. We are looking at putting people back to work.

So our government is focusing on those kinds of initiatives which support people, in spite of the fact that those areas have been neglected. We are looking at subsidizing the income of those people who in fact are striving to get off social assistance and assisting them by extending in other areas that provide for their needs.

Mrs McLeod: Long-range plans are important and they are certainly commendable, but what I want to talk to the minister about today is a record that her government brings in, and it is a record of promises, very specific promises, to deal with very immediate and very real problems.

Let me remind the minister of the promise in Agenda for People, that a New Democratic government would ensure that families no longer have to choose between paying the rent or eating, and that \$300 million would be committed to providing the safety net that is so desperately needed today.

This is not an issue which needs to be studied. People across Ontario have already supported the Blueprint for Reform. The minister's Premier promised, in response to a questionnaire from the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, that the government would move forward on social assistance with a clear timetable. When will the minister bring forward the timetable that her Premier has promised?

Hon Mrs Akande: Timetable, indeed. I would suggest that, in fact, if the Liberal government took three years to mess up the situation, it will at least give us three months to plan, not to study its cure.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mrs Cunningham: My question is for the Minister of Education, my colleague the member for London Centre. One of the minister's major campaign platforms across Ontario during this recent provincial election was to raise the provincial share of education costs to 60% over five years. The five-year plan is expected to cost \$7.5 billion. However, yesterday the Premier said a Fair Tax Commission will be looking into the issue. Does this mean that the minister is rethinking or going to study her 60% funding commitment to school boards?

Hon Mrs Boyd: The Ministry of Education is as concerned as all of us are, as citizens and as taxpayers, about this issue. The system of funding education that we have inherited from the previous two governments is miserable and not fixable. We are not prepared to tinker with that system without looking at all the possible options. I argued very strenuously in cabinet that education funding be part of the commission on fair taxation so that we could look at giving real tax relief to property taxpayers in the municipalities, and look at the best way in which to meet the promise to which we are still committed, that the

provincial government will assume 60% of the funding of education in this province.

Mrs Cunningham: The minister knows me very well and she knows how fed up I am with reports and how long we have listened to these kinds of promises. We are really, truly expecting a difference.

The third report of the select committee on education talked about co-operation around a new funding mechanism. It was supported by school boards and teachers across this province. This is not new. This kind of stuff has been talked about for the last decade. We need action now. Can the minister tell me when the government will be responding to this report, and how soon can we expect to see a new funding model for education in the province of Ontario?

Hon Mrs Boyd: The member is well aware that the members of our party were very supportive of the recommendations that came forward from the select committee. As the Premier said in the earlier question, we look forward to introducing these kinds of budget and taxation issues at budget time, as is customary in this House. The member can expect that by that point we will have very clear answers about the direction in which we are going, and that is a reasonable timetable for us to be meeting.

TAXATION

Mr Silipo: My question is for the Treasurer. The announcement yesterday in the throne speech of plans to establish a Fair Tax Commission was indeed, in my view, welcome news.

In my riding of Dovercourt, working families are struggling to get by day by day. At the same time, they see that many of the corporations they work for pay little or no tax. Will the Fair Tax Commission look at the tax write-offs and loopholes that corporations have at their disposal?

Hon Mr Laughren: I thank my friend the member for Dovercourt for the question. The member for Dovercourt should know that when we are establishing our Fair Tax Commission, it is our intention that it will look at all aspects of taxation in the province, because I agree with him that the perception out there across the province is that we do not have a fair tax system. Because I feel very strongly—and I know this will surprise some members opposite—that I do not have all the answers myself, we need some—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Laughren: The members should know that I do not have all the answers, and that by establishing a Fair Tax Commission, I hope very much that that commission will take a look at some of the loopholes that are there now, at the whole question of a minimum corporate tax, the question of an inheritance tax or some kind of wealth tax, income tax relief for taxpayers in the province, the question of a land speculation tax, and of course the whole matter of tax expenditures that are presently in effect in the province.

Having waited 19 years for that question, I hope I have provided a satisfactory answer.

1500

Mr Silipo: I think we could all agree that the issue of taxes is something about which everyone has something to say. I would like to ask the Treasurer how he will ensure that the commission conducts its work fairly and democratically.

Hon Mr Laughren: That is a perceptive question the member for Dovercourt asks. I do want to assure him most seriously that when we establish the commission, there are two ways I hope we are able to do that: One is the way in which the commission is appointed, the people who are on the commission and the groups they come from as they sit on that commission; the second is the way in which they communicate with the public at large. There are various interest groups they meet with. We are most concerned that there is a collaborative effort as we examine the tax system in the province.

It is our hope that when the process is finished, and I am hoping as well that this will not take for ever—quite frankly, that was the main reason we did not want a full-blown royal commission; we wanted some fairly quick answers on some of these issues so that we can move with dispatch to make the tax system fairer in Ontario.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Beer: My question is to the Minister of Education. I also welcome her to this House and congratulate her on her appointment. Together with the member for London North and all members, I know we want to work with the minister in ensuring that Ontario has the best education system possible.

My question to the minister follows from the question of my colleague the member for London North, and is regarding the specific commitment that the minister's party made during the election regarding the 60% funding, and second, to the commitment made by the Premier—and I have a copy here of a letter which he sent on 29 August to the chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto School Board. I would like to quote one part of that letter.

The Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, said in his letter: "Metro would clearly benefit by our proposal to increase provincial funding to 60%. New Democrats would seek to restore Metro's funding to at least the 1981 level of 21%"

It seems to me that we have had all kinds of studies that I would have assumed the government, before making a pledge of 60% and before making a pledge of going to 21%, would have determined that indeed that was possible to do, and that we would have seen expression of that in the throne speech.

Can the minister tell us if her government is planning to carry out that commitment to fund at least the 1981 level of 21% of Metropolitan Toronto's school cost, and can she set out for the House and for the people of this province today the way in which she is going to achieve that objective?

Hon Mrs Boyd: Just with respect to the generalities of the question which preceded the exact one, I would like to indicate to the member involved that this is a promise the Liberals made and did not deliver on. We intend to deliver on it.

With respect to the current funding situation for Metropolitan Toronto, we are just now receiving the final figures on which to base the general legislative grant announcements and I will give that answer to the member as soon as I have the information in hand.

Mr Beer: I would simply remind the minister that what we are concerned about here are specific commitments made by the new government. I think it is only appropriate that we try to determine whether in fact she is going to keep those commitments and, if so, how.

Another part of the education funding issue relates to capital. The minister would be aware that during the period we were in government, significant increases in funding were made for capital expansion for the construction of new schools. Indeed, in the last budget some \$332 million was pledged for school capital construction.

In the throne speech, there was mention made of a fund of some \$700 million. What I would like to ask the minister is: Can she tell the House that she will keep to the \$332 million capital commitment of the previous government, and how much of the \$700 million is going to be allocated to school capital? Can the minister make sure that any new moneys are over and above the \$332 million and that indeed the \$700 million is new dollars?

Hon Mrs Boyd: I certainly can tell the member that the funds that have been flowed for capital that were promised previously will continue. One of the reasons for that, of course, is that his government flowed them through long into the future—I think 1994 are the last ones that are through—and the communities involved are counting on those dollars and have begun their plans for those dollars.

It is not the intention of the Treasurer's fund that those not be new dollars. The Ministry of Education will be putting forward the short-term projects that would come under that plan, as will other ministries. We will be making decisions about how that money will be allocated separately from the capital funding for education.

HEALTH CARE

Mr Eves: I have a question for the Minister of Health. I would like to welcome the minister back to the Legislature in her new capacity as the Minister of Health. I am going to pass out some free advice, and it is probably worth what it is costing her: I certainly hope she has thrown away her predecessor's cue cards during question period.

Can the minister explain to this Legislature why an issue as important as health care, where her ministry spends some—as I am sure she is aware—\$16 billion during this fiscal year, was virtually left out of the throne speech?

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I will be glad to try to answer the question. I appreciate the member's kind welcome back. I should note that the Speaker and I have had an absolutely identical career in the House, so we are always glad to see each other again.

I think the member will understand that when you already spend close to \$16 billion—it is not quite \$16 billion a year yet—and one third of the total provincial budget in Health, you are going to be very careful about talking about any new programs. There are, however, new kinds of goals we would like to establish in health care, and I can assure the member that as the weeks and months go by I will be bringing forward to this Legislature changes in programs associated with the strengthening of goals for a healthy public policy in Ontario, and be glad to share them with the House and subject them to questioning and suggestions.

Mr Eves: We know and we are glad to hear that the minister has goals in mind that she would like to achieve in the health care system, but there are some very serious immediate problems in the health care system such as the nursing shortage and her Premier's commitment for pay equity to the nursing profession to bring nursing salaries up to the levels where they should be. The minister does not have many months to consider this. She has a few short weeks until 31 March 1991 to deal with that issue in particular. There are waiting lists for all different types of treatment and surgery in Ontario. There are thousands of beds that are closed in this province. All of those issues need very immediate and direct action on her part. What specific action is the minister taking to deal with those three specific issues immediately, and does she not think that they are worth more than a throwaway line in the throne speech?

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I cannot advise the member on what he should do with the line in his throne speech, but I am not going to throw mine away. All those problems that he addresses in his question are serious problems; they are immediate problems. I do not wish to say that I feel my life rushing away in front of me as I think about these problems, but they are very serious and immediate problems. I want him to take heart from the fact that I believe a lot of good work has been done in the field of health in this province, that we have a lot of goodwill, expertise and knowhow to build on in the delivery of health care services, and I am sure that with the resources we have available, we will be able to address those problems, which are urgent and which are serious, over the next few weeks and months.

1510

COURT SYSTEM

Mr Lessard: My question is directed to the Attorney General and it deals with delays in criminal prosecutions. That is an issue that was dealt with earlier this afternoon.

It is obvious that we have inherited a system that is suffering from the neglect of the previous government. As a result, victims of crime must face the injustice of seeing

alleged criminals go free without their day in court. I was pleased to hear that the Attorney General is introducing specific proposals to deal with the problems of court backlogs, and I noted that those proposals are very general in nature.

It appears to me that it is obvious that the problems are much more severe in some parts of the province than they are in others. I know that in the city of Windsor and the county of Essex a couple of years ago there was a problem with court backlogs, and simple criminal matters were taking up to nine months to be prosecuted. Through the co-operation and partnership of the Criminal Lawyers Association of Windsor and Essex County, judges, court administrators and the crown attorney, this delay was reduced to about five months.

Given that in the city of Windsor this backlog has been dealt with successfully, can the minister give us some explanation as to why this problem still exists in some areas of the province and not in others?

Hon Mr Hampton: I want to thank the member for what is a very good question and a carefully put question.

I want to say first of all that the member is quite correct; there is not a court backlog in general throughout the province, but there are court backlogs which are rather severe in some locations, specifically the suburban Metropolitan Toronto area and what is basically known as the greater Toronto area, the Kitchener area and in part in Ottawa. If the member looks at the picture on a province-wide basis, he will see that in general, where there has been a large population growth, there can be a problem. As well, in areas that have a large international airport, such as the Brampton area, that contributes to the problem with the number of drug charges and so on. So there are a number of factors.

However, the fact still remains that some areas have managed the problem better than others. I want to acknowledge that in the Windsor area, the regional crown attorney and the regional senior judges have done an excellent job in terms of making the court system work well. That is one of the challenges we face. There is a management issue here. The system has to be managed better and there is the challenge there for the judiciary and there is a challenge there for crown attorneys and a challenge there for the police to indeed manage the system better, as has been done in the Windsor area.

HIGHWAY 416

Mr Daigeler: My question is to the Minister of Health. People in eastern Ontario, and in Ottawa-Carleton in particular, are in an uproar today because of her government's refusal to make a firm commitment towards the completion of the Highway 416 project. As the minister knows only too well, since she comes from Ottawa Centre, we have been waiting for this link between the nation's capital and Highway 401 for over 25 years. People in eastern Ontario will not back down on what has been promised to us by my government when we were in power.

Is this dithering on the government's part an indication that the NDP will follow the Mulroney lead of penalizing the Ottawa area because it voted mostly Liberal in the last election?

Hon Mrs Gigantes: Mr Speaker, I believe the question should be redirected to the Minister of Transportation.

The Speaker: Redirect.

Hon Mr Philip: I would be pleased to answer the member's question.

Highway 416 will be completed; it will be completed on time. The delay that the member talks about was a delay that was created by the previous government. I have reviewed the reasons for that delay and find that the Minister of Transportation for the previous government acted properly, that in fact the delay was called for, that there were some problems concerning unstable soil and if that problem had not been corrected there could have been grave damage in the construction to the homes along Highway 416. The minister acted appropriately, under the previous government, in causing that delay.

We are now proceeding and I am sure that the member, when he goes back home, will find that I have communicated that to the various interest groups and they are very happy at the progress that we are making on Highway 416.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: My supplementary question will be directed to the Minister of Transportation, with regret. I find it almost unbelievable that the member who is responsible for eastern Ontario is not willing to answer a question about her area of the province.

Certainly the statement the minister has made in the House today is very different from that he made in the press yesterday. There seems to be a great deal of conflict in his statements in the press and in this House. I want him to reconfirm his time lines. He has said "on time." That is not what was reported in the press yesterday. Would he please reaffirm in this House his commitment and the time lines he is willing to fulfil?

Hon Mr Philip: I would like to point out to the member that a minister can only, by the rules of this House, answer a question related to his own portfolio. The member should know better than to direct a transportation question to the Minister of Health, no matter how qualified that member may be to answer transportation questions.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Would the minister take his seat, please. I certainly appreciate your assistance in interpreting the rules. Perhaps you would be kind enough to leave that to me. If you choose to respond to the question, we all would be delighted to hear the answer.

Hon Mr Philip: I would be happy to respond to the question. I can assure the member that the highway will be completed on time, on schedule and, indeed, that the original delay which was caused by her government has

been taken care of, that all of the problems have been dealt with and that we are proceeding as quickly as possible.

PLANT CLOSURE

Mr Tilson: My question is to the Minister of Labour. I know the minister is aware of the circumstances concerning the closure last week of the Fedders plant in Orangeville. I would like to ask the minister how he reacts to an employer, such as Fedders, which takes the unusual step of laying off two thirds of its striking force, cancels two scheduled meetings with the ministry mediator, only to show up at a third meeting to announce the closure of its production facility.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I think the member should be aware that one of the reasons we are looking at extensive changes to the Employment Standards Act and the Labour Relations Act in Ontario is as a result of a perception that things are unfair in terms of the way workers are treated in this particular province and the fact that we have a situation that is truly scary, where there is a 77% increase in the number of workers affected by permanent shutdowns and partial shutdowns in this province over the last year.

1520

Mr Tilson: I am glad to hear the minister take that position because the Fedders case is certainly but one of many plant shutdowns around the province where workers are being left high and dry. Considering the fact that the government's Agenda for People contains a commitment to improve the severance and notice provisions of the Employment Standards Act, and the throne speech vaguely refers to stronger measures of layoff notice, severance and other adjustment issues, will the minister now tell the House precisely what he is going to do in this area and when?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: The member will also know that we took the first steps with the announcement of the establishment of a wage protection fund in the province of Ontario. We will be fleshing that out in a very short period of time. The amendments and the changes to the Employment Standards Act and the worker adjustment programs, including notice and severance, will be announced in this House in due course.

TAXATION

Mr Owens: My question is for the Treasurer. One of the most important issues that came up at the doorstep during this last election was taxation. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that we are sitting on this side of the House is as a result of the taxation policies of the former government. My question to the Treasurer then is, will appointment of this commission preclude this government from implementing any of the programs that we described during the election?

Hon Mr Laughren: No. It is very much my hope that when the commission is appointed that will not

preclude it from giving us some interim reports with recommendations. It also is my hope that by the 1991-92 budget—in other words, next spring—we will be able to implement at least some of those fair tax promises that were in our Agenda for People. We very much want to go forward with those. At the same time, I also want to make sure that there is an opportunity for some interim reports to come back from the Fair Tax Commission so that we have a more knowledgeable base on which we make those decisions.

MOTIONS

PRESIDING OFFICERS

Miss Martel moved that Mr Morin, member for the electoral district of Carleton East, be appointed Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House; that Mrs Haslam, member for the electoral district of Perth, be appointed First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House, and that Mr Villeneuve, member for the electoral district of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, be appointed Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Miss Martel moved that, notwithstanding standing order 94(a), the House will not meet on Thursday mornings to consider private members' public business until Thursday 13 December 1990, and that, notwithstanding standing order 94(h), notice for the first four ballot items be given not later than Monday 10 December 1990.

Motion agreed to.

PETITION

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Mr Cousens: It is a pleasure to make the first petition in this House in the new session for the people of Markham and Unionville. I made it several times to the previous government. They did not listen to it, so we will see what happens this time.

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas the absence of traffic signals on Highway 7 at the entrance of Union Villa and the shops of Unionville Plaza in the town of Markham poses a serious threat to pedestrian and driver safety, we request that the Ministry of Transportation move immediately to install traffic signals at the abovementioned location so as to safely alternate a right of way between conflicting flows of vehicle and pedestrian traffic."

Signed by me and signed by at least 100 people in and around the Markham area who are suffering with this terrible problem. Let's hope the new Minister of Transportation acts a lot more expeditiously than the former minister.

The Speaker: May I take this opportunity to remind members that when presenting petitions all that is required is a short summary of the substance. It is not necessary to read it verbatim nor to editorialize.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

TOWN OF RICHMOND HILL ACT, 1990

Mr Sorbara moved first reading of Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the Town of Richmond Hill.

Motion agreed to.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Chiarelli moved first reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act and the Municipal Elections Act respecting the election of the Chairman of the Regional Council.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Chiarelli: The bill is to provide for the election of the chairman of the regional council of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton by direct vote of the electors in the regional municipality.

CITY OF VANIER ACT, 1990

Mr Grandmaître moved first reading of Bill Pr30, An Act respecting the City of Vanier.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF WINDSOR ACT, 1990

Mr Lessard moved first reading of Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Runciman: I have a point of order on the rotation system.

The Speaker: We are introducing bills, and it is the member who is seen first by the Speaker. The Speaker will get to every person who wishes to introduce a bill today.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

Ms Churley: Mr Speaker, I have six of these. Do I do them each individually?

The Speaker: Yes.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

WOLFE CONSORTIUM FOR ADVANCED STUDIES INC ACT, 1990

Mr Runciman moved first reading of Bill Pr46, An Act respecting the Wolfe Consortium for Advanced Studies Inc.

Motion agreed to.

1540

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Consideration of the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr Malkowski moved, seconded by Mrs Mathysen, that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable Lincoln M. Alexander, a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, Knight of Grace of the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law, bachelor of arts, doctor of laws, colonel in Her Majesty's armed forces supplementary reserve, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr Malkowski: I am truly honoured and privileged to move the adoption of the speech from the throne. I

believe that this throne speech captures the essence of the "new Ontario" as envisioned by our government, led by Premier Bob Rae and the New Democratic Party.

I know, Mr Speaker, that you indeed support and embody the principles by which we will, as a people, be governed in these very tough times ahead. This speech offers not only practical solutions but also the philosophical guidance necessary in a time construed by many as economically and politically bankrupt.

Mr Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you and to wish you well in keeping the House in order. I am sure that we will have many spirited debates. When I was elected to the Legislature to represent the riding of York East, I made a commitment to listen to my constituents. I would hope that collectively we, as members of the Legislature, ensure that we do our best to remember that we are here to serve the people first.

It would be remiss of me if I did not address some historic firsts. I think that it is no accident of history that, as the first deaf politician in the world who uses American sign language, I am in the Legislature. Perhaps fortune was kind on 6 September 1990, but if it were not for the Ontario New Democratic Party and its commitment to the principles of equity and equality, frankly, I would not be here. I know that I am the first of many representing the "new Ontario" who sit in this House.

This "new Ontario" is one in which all our institutions will more accurately reflect the wider society in which we live. This is an Ontario of openness, one that is a partnership with those previously denied access to not just the corridors of power but also jobs, education and housing. I mean those who are disabled, including deaf people, racial minorities, aboriginal people, francophones and women.

I hope I can convey the parameters of what this "new Ontario" will encompass. As you know, Mr Speaker, I am the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship, and I am very proud to participate in the challenges that face us in this government and in our ministry.

As a long-time community advocate, and not just for the deaf, I know that we have a lot of work ahead of us in redressing inequity. Our ministry mandate requires that we address the concerns of seniors and the disabled. All that is contained in race relations, employment equity and human rights is in our purview.

I would emphasize, however, that we solely are not responsible for the results. This is a government that encourages and wants involvement by the people and for the people. I would reiterate the throne speech: "politics is about far more than what we can all get: it is also about what we owe each other."

Our job as the government is to ensure the mechanisms for access. One of the measures will take the form of both employment equity legislation and adjusting the pay equity legislation to excluded women workers.

Earlier, I mentioned historic firsts and I would like to acknowledge that the last time social democrats held the seat in York East was from 1949 to 1951 when Agnes

Macphail, a tireless fighter, reformer and CCFer, held York East.

Members will recall that Agnes Macphail, who was also the first female member of Parliament in Ottawa, spoke in the Ontario Legislature and said: "I realize too that there is nothing so powerful as an idea whose day has arrived. Timing is the thing!...we are passing through an age of social consciousness and many things are being accomplished now that could not have been done a generation ago."

One of Macphail's greatest triumphs was the passage of a bill granting equal pay for equal work for men and women in Ontario. I feel we have to finish this job, started almost 40 years ago. Macphail always said: "My interest has been and is still—and will I think remain—the people, and the people least able to look out for themselves. I have never been interested in the powerful and the rich, because I think that they get more than their share anyway."

I think this is an appropriate time to talk about the political and economic realities facing us as a government. We will govern in the interests of working people, ordinary people, those most vulnerable. It is our task to ensure that although we are severely constrained by the recession, we need to protect the increasing numbers of those most vulnerable.

I believe, as our government does, that the introduction of employment equity legislation will go a long way to help alleviate the problems of some of those constituents who have been previously excluded from the economy. The message in the province of Ontario is that inequity, intolerance, bigotry and discrimination of any sort can no longer be tolerated. Fair hiring practices are only one solution to tackling this systemic problem.

I think it is important to say that the message delivered by His Honour is really just the beginning of a dialogue which will continue with the people of Ontario. I think it is also fair to say that it is unrealistic to expect, as the public has been led to expect, that everything everyone wants is contained in the throne speech. This is a difficult message to give to people, especially in these times of instant news.

It is politically unrealistic and economically not viable in times of restraint to promise something to everyone. It is fair to say that this is the continuation of the agenda for the people of Ontario that our government set in motion some time ago. It is fair to say political and economic adjustments take time. Our government has an economic plan that will include both long-term and short-term measures that will help alleviate poverty.

I know that we can talk about all these things in the abstract. However, each one of us can think of a particular family caught between workers' compensation and welfare, the single mom working several jobs, tenants paying too much rent, the Thursday dropin for seniors, the barber on the corner street, the pastor working in his or her community, the shopkeepers at our local plazas. This is who I am really talking about. I know and have spoken to a lot of people in York East.

York East is largely the area known as the borough of East York, ranging from modest, single-family homes to very large apartment buildings, to very expensive homes. Macphail refers to the "historic and populous constituency of York East." I suspect, however, that the York East she was referring to was still rural by our standards. The York East of today is very much a small town experiencing big-city problems of development, high rents, a diverse ethnic population, a large senior population and nowhere to grow without a great deal of change. The problems to some extent appear invisible; however, they are not.

1550

The increasing number of calls to my office reflects the economic downturn. I am truly afraid for those who will, because of spiralling rental costs, increased tax burdens, those unemployed because of ill health, age, lack of training or education, and those who are the working poor, have to do without.

I do know that a number of measures, as outlined in our government's agenda, will go a long way to help.

I think we have to understand that our message is about people. It is about how we talk to each other and also how we treat each other. When we talk about the environment, housing or jobs, we should understand that these issues are inextricably linked with how we treat each other and what we owe each other.

Mrs Mathysen: May I add my congratulations on your election, Mr Speaker.

I am most honoured today to second the motion to adopt the speech from the throne. I would also like to say it is my great privilege to humbly stand before this House as the chosen representative of the people of Middlesex. It is a job I intend to do with diligence and integrity.

I would also like to congratulate the member for York East on his eloquently stated motion for adoption of the speech from the throne.

The riding of Middlesex has a wonderful diversity of economic activity and population. It is comprised of all of Middlesex county with two segments of the city of London, one that extends east of the Clarke Sideroad to the city limits, and another east of Highbury and north of Huron Street. This rural and urban mix, some 77,000 strong, gives the riding a rich and complex nature while posing a number of challenges.

I have spent the last 10 weeks since the September election meeting with individuals, seniors, students, interest groups, hospital boards, care givers, administrators, boards of education, educators, as well as town and township councillors, in an effort to better understand the concerns of the people of Middlesex.

I am most gratified and certainly proud to be a part of a government that has stated its commitment to consultation with and inclusion of the people it serves. I know I can bring the concerns of the people of Middlesex to this place and their voices will be heard.

I would like to acquaint members with the constituents of Middlesex and the challenges facing us and our communities. I would like to begin with the rural

residents of the riding and provide a sense of the perennial struggle of many of these farm families to survive and keep the family farm as part of Ontario's landscape.

Middlesex county has some of the best agricultural land in Ontario. The production of our farmers ranges over the entire spectrum of agricultural commodities, but these people, who work in the second-largest industry in Ontario, face overwhelming problems. The problems that have dogged Ontario's farm population since the early 1980s seem to have now reached crisis proportion.

Middlesex producers are grappling with low returns for commodities. Farmers are paid at levels that have progressively eroded over the last decade. Even the returns of producers of supply-managed commodities receiving their cost of production have not kept pace with inflation. This, coupled with the high interest rate policy of the Bank of Canada, has left many farm families tottering on the brink of a frightening and uncertain future.

This uncertainty affects the quality of life among Middlesex farm families and has put into question the future of agriculture, not just because of the financial cost, but also because of the human cost.

I recently met with a group of women—my neighbours in fact—who pioneered a Middlesex chapter of Women for the Survival of Agriculture. Their message was very clear and very direct. They are fighting for the survival of their families and their way of life. They have seen the havoc that hard economic times visits upon the family. These people of integrity and commitment cannot—must not—be abandoned. The family farm must not be lost. We need the next generation of farmers.

I would also like to mention in this regard the almost unbearable pressure placed on the producers whose land surrounds large urban centres. Despite the skill, knowledge, labour, large investment and devotion to a rural lifestyle, these farmers are finding that the sale of the land itself is their only solution to hard economic realities. Parcels of land from these farms are sold to developers in an effort to find the money to go on. This attempt at survival ironically has led to the death of the land. It is taken out of production, it is paved over, buildings appear and it is gone for ever.

As the countryside loses its capacity to produce food, we face a very real threat to our food supply. Food is the key to our ability to determine what happens in Ontario. We cannot afford to become dependent on others for this most vital necessity.

The urban sector benefits from a strong rural base, and the benefits go beyond just a food supply. The farmer is a consumer too. Farm families support businesses, pay taxes and utilize urban services. For the farmers of Middlesex, for the urban dwellers of Middlesex, I applaud the government's commitment to improve programs to stabilize farm incomes and ensure that rural Ontarians, the farmers of my riding, will be able to provide for their families and our families while they continue to live on the land.

The urban residents of Middlesex come from not just the city of London, but from the many small towns and villages dotting the county. The smaller community,

whether it be Parkhill, Westminster, Melbourne, Strathroy, Newbury, Wardsville, Ilderton or Nairn, embodies a spirit of commitment to the wellbeing of each of the members of that community.

I have been approached by a number of groups from the small centres of Middlesex seeking assistance so they can, through their volunteer organizations and committees, provide housing for seniors, the handicapped and lower-income families, and services for the elderly, for those requiring home care and non-profit child care centres. These are all worthy projects and the fact that there are so many people in the towns and village of Middlesex devoted to giving time and energy to such undertakings gives a sense of the kind of people who live in my riding.

The spirit of care-giving, of volunteerism that marks Ontario's society as a society that seeks to enhance the quality of life among its members still exists and is at the centre of why so many people are drawn to make their homes in these small municipalities. As a result, these smaller centres have become the victims of their own success. Tremendous pressure has been put on these towns and villages to expand and develop residentially, commercially and industrially.

This growth demands that sewer and water services be extended beyond the traditional urban areas. If we are to ensure an environment that is clean and safe for our children, we must come to terms with the handling of waste and pollutants. I am gratified to see the government's commitment to the environmental health of the province.

In addition, the availability of clean, safe drinking water, once so much a part of what we took for granted in Middlesex, and indeed in Ontario, is an increasing concern.

A number of my constituent communities have experienced severe water shortages, as well as poor water quality. The fear of contamination of water supplies is ever present. Clean water is an essential. We can take its availability for granted no more. This is part of the environmental challenge all Ontarians face. Our new government's pledge to a Safe Drinking Water Act will help my constituent communities to acquire the water supply they need, and the pledge to the protection of the Great Lakes will be a welcome relief to the communities that hope to secure fresh water supplies from the lakes in the future.

1600

The constituents I represent from the city of London live in the northern and eastern part of the city. They represent a wide range of backgrounds, incomes and interests. Many of them work in jobs connected to small businesses as well as to the service, manufacturing and automotive industries. The Ford plant at Talbotville in the riding of Elgin provides not only primary employment but many spinoff jobs that are essential to the economic wellbeing of my constituents.

These are the people who create the wealth. They are a very real part of what makes Ontario strong, but they

too are vulnerable. The realities of free trade and the downturn in the economy threaten their ability to provide for their families. They are turning to the government of Ontario for help to avoid painful upheavals in their lives. The wage protection fund initiated by the new government is certainly a significant part of that help. Another is the proposed solution through education.

This educational solution is most welcome. The people of Middlesex are concerned about the education of their children. They want young Ontarians to have the background that will prepare them to meet the challenges of a global community. They want their children to reach their full potential in a stable, properly funded educational system. As the job market becomes less labour intensive, it becomes incumbent upon the education system to enable the citizens of Middlesex, indeed Ontario, to participate fully in the economic life of the province.

The second part of the education solution is the retraining and upgrading of the skills of those constituents who are dependent upon a manufacturing sector currently in decline. The throne speech has clearly shown that employers and industry have a vital role to play in the support of these upgrading programs.

The new government's promise to work with the private sector in research and development speaks of a new era of co-operation in investment in ourselves. This initiative speaks of faith in the ability of Ontarians to create new jobs based on innovation and new technology. It speaks to something we have always known, something the people of Canada, the people of Middlesex have always known, and that is that we can do it better than anyone in the world.

The next group of Middlesex constituents I would like to tell you about are not urban, are not rural, are not from small towns or a big city, but rather are from all of these. They are the vulnerable members of our society. Though I have always been aware of their plight, this last 10 weeks has brought me much closer to a true understanding of the urgency of that plight. They are the senior citizens, the recipients of social assistance and the working poor who are at the mercy of an unresponsive rent control system.

Sadly, landlords in my constituency still use intimidation and threats of eviction to frighten tenants into submission. Last Friday evening, I received a telephone call that was a cry for help. The tenants of an apartment complex had just been notified that the landlord's rent control appeal had been upheld and that the tenants are now faced with payment of back rent in addition to a monthly increase of 40 per cent. For many of them struggling on fixed incomes, minimum wage or social assistance, it was news of catastrophic proportions.

Other tenants in Middlesex live in substandard apartment units that absentee landlords refuse to repair. These tenants have also been calling out for real rent control and now, at last, they will have it.

Others in my constituency are victims of poverty and despair. They need affordable housing, employment equity, pay equity, reliable and affordable child care, affordable automobile insurance and a fairer tax system; in short, a chance to share in the greatness of Ontario instead of being

at the mercy of those who have prevented their full participation. This speech from the throne has given them a ray of hope.

There is one last group of Middlesex constituents that I would like to include. In the southwestern part of my constituency are three communities of native people. After the events of this past summer, I was concerned that it would take a long time for me to build the kind of bonds and communication, trust and friendship that would enable me to truly represent them in the Ontario Legislature.

I had known some of these Muncey, Chippewa and Oneida people as my students in the school where I taught English. I had known others as school friends and colleagues who counselled the native students, but I had never known about their community life and I did not know how I could be the representative they deserved.

The solution to my concern presented itself very recently. I was invited to the Remembrance Day service and community dinner held on the reserve. As with all such acts of remembrance, there was reverence and solemnity in the official service, but under that sincere act of remembrance was a joyful celebration of and commitment to the land the veterans had served and died to protect. It was a service like no other of which I had been part. Of the 126 native people in attendance, 32 were veterans. The ceremony and dinner that followed was a time of comradeship, mutual respect and unqualified acceptance. They embraced my participation and the participation of others from the non-native community with friendship and grace.

This community is currently busy organizing to provide a new school for its elementary children. I was given the chance to see people who are finding enthusiastic, talented leaders among them. I am most proud to say that I am a member of a government committed to fair negotiations with first nations as they move towards self-government.

In conclusion, I would like to share the message I have heard over and over from the people of Middlesex. They have entrusted us with the task to govern fairly, honestly and with courage. They deserve nothing less. On the first evening of our new government, 1 October 1990, as I moved among the crowds who came to their Legislative Assembly, I knew the people were truly here. Yesterday's speech from the throne gives voice to their aspirations, their hopes and their dreams. Once again, I would like to second the motion to adopt the speech from the throne, because it says indeed that the people are truly here.

Mr Nixon: Before I move adjournment, as for the agreement that normally occurs, I just want to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder who have just spoken. The member for York East had an excellent presentation and I heartily concur with his interest, commitment and sensitivity to the social programs of the province and the requirement that the government and the House direct its attention to ameliorating the inadequacies that have somehow survived the last five years, in fact the last 123 years.

I thought I should just mention that his predecessor, Christine Hart, was also well respected in this House. She has gone on perforce to other responsibilities, but she was a close friend and colleague of mine and I just wanted to mention how much her service in the community and this House was appreciated.

I was also particularly interested in the comments made by the seconder for a number of reasons. I am a farmer myself and she comes from a rural area. I paid close attention to her comments about the utilization of farm land and the way farmers are put to a point almost in extremis in order to finance their operations, with low prices and inadequate financing, by having to, heaven help us, sell lots in the agricultural community. So it is interesting to hear her views in this connection as they reflect Middlesex county.

I just wanted to mention something that I would either mention now or in my address that will continue tomorrow, briefly, that her closing comments which stimulated such an enthusiastic response and approval, to the effect that somehow the people are now here, has another side to it. I feel frankly that the democratic process, which up until now has not returned a New Democratic government, has not been totally flawed, in spite of her views and the views of the present leader of the government in that regard. The democratic process has been alive and well and working as effectively as her predecessor and my predecessors could make it.

As a matter of fact, there is a comment in the speech itself, to which I would think the Premier, if he had anything to do with this, might have given further consideration. It is on page 1: "As a group of people accustomed to being on the outside of the established power structures in Ontario, my government will open Queen's Park to those who have never before had an effective voice in the corridors of power."

[Applause]

Mr Nixon: I notice particularly that those who are extracted from the extreme socialist core of the party are most enthused by this, because somehow they feel they have been excluded. I am concerned that that attitude may very well carry over inappropriately to their new responsibilities.

I further want to say, if I may, that the honourable member may recall her predecessor, Doug Reycraft, once again a colleague of mine, who worked quite closely with me in the work of the Treasury, as did Christine Hart. While I welcome her to the House and appreciate her comments, I wanted to comment at this time that he in his way, which was effective and important, served his community here, and I wanted to express my appreciation.

In so doing, Mr Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion by Mr Nixon, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1612.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algonia	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Wednesday 21 November 1990

Motion		
Assistants for disabled members	2109	
Miss Martel		
Mr Elston		
Agreed to	2109	
Members' statements		
Regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton	2109	
Mr Chiarelli		
Recycling Week	2110	
Mr Cousens		
David Reville	2110	
Ms Churley		
Highway 17A in Kenora	2110	
Mr Miclash		
Health care	2110	
Mr J. Wilson		
Community Living Alternatives, Scarborough	2111	
Mr Owens		
French-language services	2111	
Mr Beer		
Nuclear power	2111	
Mr Carr		
Northern Ontario	2111	
Mr Wood		
Statements by the ministry		
Court system	2112	
Mr Hampton		
Waste management	2113	
Mrs Grier		
Anti-drug strategies	2114	
Mr Farman		
Responses		
Court system	2114	
Mr Sorbara		
Waste management	2115	
Mrs Sullivan		
Court system	2115	
Mr Harnick		
Waste management	2115	
Mr Cousens		
Anti-drug strategies	2116	
Mr Carr		
Oral questions		
Government strategies	2116	
Mr Nixon		
Mr Rae		
Ms Lankin		
Nuclear power	2117	
Mr Nixon		
Mr Rae		
Government policies	2118	
Mr Harris		
Mr Rae		
Investment in Ontario	2119	
Mr Harris		
Mr Rae		
Social assistance	2120	
Mrs McLeod		
Mrs Akande		
Education funding	2120	
Mrs Cunningham		
Mrs Boyd		
Taxation	2121	
Mr Silipo		
Mr Laughren		
Education funding	2121	
Mr Beer		
Mrs Boyd		
Health care	2122	
Mr Eves		
Mrs Gigantes		
Court system	2122	
Mr Lessard		
Mr Hampton		
Highway 416	2123	
Mr Daigeler		
Mr Philip		
Plant closure	2124	
Mr Tilson		
Mr MacKenzie		
Taxation	2124	
Mr Owens		
Mr Laughren		
Motions		
Presiding officers	2124	
Miss Martel		
Agreed to	2124	
Private members' public business	2124	
Miss Martel		
Agreed to	2124	
Petition		
Traffic signals	2124	
Mr Cousens		
First readings		
Town of Richmond Hill Act, 1990, Bill Pr26	2125	
Mr Sorbara		
Agreed to	2125	

Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton	City of Toronto Act, Bill Pr35	2125
Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 2	Ms Churley	
Mr Chiarelli	Agreed to	2125
Agreed to	Wolfe Consortium for Advanced	
City of Vanier Act, 1990, Bill Pr30	Studies Inc Act, 1990 Bill Pr46	2125
Mr Grandmaître	Mr Runciman	
Agreed to	Agreed to	2125
City of Windsor Act, 1990, Bill Pr21		
Mr Lessard	Throne speech debate	
Agreed to		
City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr1	Motion for an address	2125
Ms Churley	Mr Malkowski	2125
Agreed to	Mrs Mathysen	2127
City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr25	Mr Nixon	2129
Ms Churley		
Agreed to	Other business	
City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr27		
Ms Churley	Legislative pages	2109
Agreed to	The Speaker	
City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr32	Board of Internal Economy	2112
Ms Churley	The Speaker	
Agreed to	Adjournment	2129
City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr33		
Ms Churley	Lists of members	
Agreed to		
City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr34	Members and their responsibilities	2130
Ms Churley		
Agreed to		

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 21 novembre 1990

Déclaration d'un député

Services en français	2111
M. Beer	



58 1990

58 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 22 November 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 22 novembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938. Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 22 November 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

ORDERS AND NOTICES

The Speaker: I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House a clerical error that appeared in Orders and Notices published under today's date. The error in question is to be found on page 4 of that document under the heading of "Special Debates: Opposition Day," standing in the name of the leader of the third party, the member for Nipissing. In the second line of that notice the word "laughs" was printed inadvertently, whereas the correct word should have been "layoffs."

This will be corrected in the next printing for Monday 26 November 1990. On behalf of the journals branch, I apologize to the leader of the third party and regret any embarrassment that this error has caused.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ELECTION FINANCES

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the 15th report of the Commission on Election Finances.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

REGULATION OF FINANCIAL PLANNERS

Mr Chiarelli: Later today I will be introducing a bill which would give individual investors and consumer groups new protections and rights for a broad range of investor products.

The time has come for tighter legislation for the regulation of financial planners in Ontario. In Ottawa, over 2,500 investors recently lost up to \$185 million as a result of the failure of seven financial planning firms. In Kitchener, investors lost up to \$125 million in what Financial Post reporter Diane Francis recently described as a financial horror story.

In the absence of government regulation, such fiascos are only bound to get worse. Compounding the problem will be new federal legislation integrating financial institutions, which will create an onslaught of marketing of investment products in an increasingly competitive marketplace that will require new consumer protection measures.

The Premier has called for a kinder and gentler Legislature. I would therefore ask that he kindly and gently approve this timely and necessary bill for second reading and have it referred to committee for further review and adoption.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs Witmer: November is Wife Assault Prevention Month. Eliminating violence against women is one of the

most critical challenges facing us. Every community in Ontario offers tragic evidence that far more needs to be done. It is estimated that one in eight women suffers abuse in her marital relationship. Half of the women who seek refuge in a shelter are turned away due to a lack of space. This province still has not enacted victim's rights legislation, and now we hear from the Attorney General that some 3,000 sexual assault cases may be dismissed because of the backlog in our courts.

I am very disappointed by this government's lack of response to violence against women. All that it has done is to extend the previous government's program. Women who were looking for some indication in the speech from the throne were disappointed.

Although other, less serious problems can be addressed at a future time, the problem of wife abuse cannot wait. The time for action is now. This government must take bold initiatives and provide adequate and permanent funding to do the job that needs to be done. Bold initiatives must be taken in three areas: public education, police enforcement and support services for victims. All three are critical to eliminating the abuse of women.

TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION SAFETY

Mr Dadamo: As parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation, I have been asked to look into public safety issues. At this time I would like to commend the Toronto Transit Commission for its exemplary safety record and also to express my ministry's support of safety initiatives undertaken by transit systems throughout the province.

As well, I wish to bring to the attention of the House that the week of 4 to 10 November was proclaimed TTC Safe Drivers' Week. The TTC dedicated this week to honour its employees, who have worked hard to bring the people of Ontario the safest transit system in North America.

For the 19th time in 25 years, the TTC has won the American Public Transit Association's Silver Award for safe driving. This award is given annually to the North American transit system with the best overall passenger and traffic safety record.

The TTC has not only established its enviable safety record, but it continues to improve on this record. May I add that last year was its safest year yet.

Mr Speaker, I wish to congratulate TTC drivers, employers and managers in achieving such a high level of safety for our citizens. So I ask you and members to join me in showing our appreciation and congratulations for its strong dedication to safety.

GOVERNMENT FACILITIES

Mr Bradley: I am relieved that the new government has finally decided to continue the policy of the previous Liberal government to decentralize provincial govern-

ment operations and, specifically, to confirm the announcement of former Government Services minister Chris Ward to move the Ministry of Transportation to St Catharines and the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation to Niagara Falls.

The location of these ministries in the Niagara region will allow our part of the province to diversify its economy, which has been consistently affected by fluctuations in the national economy, and will in part insulate the Niagara region from the effects of a recession. The economic spinoffs of the construction of new government buildings and significant permanent payrolls will give a real boost to an area which has traditionally experienced higher rates of unemployment than the provincial average.

The location of the Ministry of Transportation complex in the central part of St Catharines would be a major factor in the revitalization of our downtown area, as it would breathe new life into businesses in the core of the city and encourage others to establish commercial and retail firms in this section. It would also allow young people and others in our city to remain in St Catharines rather than having to move to other parts of the province to gain job opportunities.

In addition to the obvious benefits to the Niagara region, the decentralization of the ministries will permit savings in the form of a reduction in the rental costs incurred in Metropolitan Toronto and the infusion of thinking from small communities in government decision-making.

To those of us who have worked hard to convince the provincial government to move the MTO to St Catharines, the confirmation of this progressive step is good news and will allow Mayor Joe McCaffery to refer to St Catharines with accuracy and pride as the transportation capital of Ontario.

1340

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mrs Cunningham: The government's throne speech contained no commitments for post-secondary education in Ontario. Without specific programs or initiatives, the statement that "our human resources will be key to our economic future" rings hollow. Colleges and universities have already suffered five years of Liberal neglect and underfunding. The situation is so bleak that the Council of Ontario Universities labelled the previous government's policy directions "a blueprint for mediocrity."

From the throne speech, one would assume that the New Democratic Party is content to maintain the status quo. The 1989 Tripartite Committee on Interprovincial Comparisons reported that Ontario ranked ninth out of 10 provinces in operating grants per student, yet there was no mention of the long-standing NDP commitment to bring Ontario's operating grants up to the national average.

Colleges across the province are running deficits, yet the restructuring of our community colleges, as recommended by the Vision 2000 report, was not mentioned. David Peterson's commitment to post-secondary educa-

tion did not match his rhetoric about the need for a highly skilled workforce to maintain our economic competitiveness.

In the throne speech, the Premier gave us some more fanciful statements. Let us hope that, unlike its predecessor, this government will make a real commitment to post-secondary education in Ontario.

USE OF MUNICIPAL STATIONERY

Mrs Caplan: The speech from the throne talked about "integrity" and "standards of behaviour." The speech also said that "when mistakes are made, the government will admit to them."

Here is a situation that will give the new Premier an opportunity to live up to that commitment.

Will Ferguson, the member for Kitchener and parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, was being questioned by the Kitchener-Waterloo Record about his use of Ministry of Municipal Affairs letterhead to endorse the campaign of a candidate who hopes to replace the member for Kitchener on city council next week. On 17 November, the Kitchener-Waterloo Record quoted the member for Kitchener saying that he was "too busy to run out and get a separate piece of paper just to satisfy someone's concern at the Record."

We all agree that if an MPP wishes to endorse candidates, he or she has every right to do so. The journalist's question had to with propriety. Should the member be using ministry letterhead for this personal, partisan, political purpose? Does not the use of letterhead imply that there is a government endorsement for this candidate?

The K-W Record journalist asked a legitimate question of propriety.

When asked again at a later date to respond to the impropriety concern, the member said that the paper cost one and a half cents and that the alderman who was questioning ought to "get a life."

Is the use of letterhead for this purpose acceptable to the Premier? Is the member's attitude and conduct acceptable to the Premier? Surely he will agree that the people of Kitchener-Waterloo deserve an apology.

Interjections.

ORDER OF MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

The Speaker: Members may find this hard to believe, but the Speaker made an error and missed seeing the member for Middlesex, whose turn it was in rotation for a statement. With your forgiveness, I will allow the member for Middlesex and then move to the Conservative Party.

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, I am just wondering with respect to the rotation. You are going to go to us next and then to the Tories and back around to us. Will we have enough time?

The Speaker: That is correct.

Hon Miss Martel: We will have two more.

The Speaker: Yes, no problem.

SHELTER FOR WOMEN

Mrs Mathysen: Of all women murdered in Canada in 1987, 61.7 per cent died as a result of domestic violence. This startling statistic points to the devastating toll that domestic violence takes upon the family. Children exposed to these attacks become either victims or batterers themselves, and the battered spouses live in a state of perpetual fear, isolation and self-doubt.

Rural women are just as vulnerable as their urban sisters. In response to this, a group of dedicated Strathroy and area women have worked for many months, with the kind assistance of my predecessor, Mr Reycraft, to establish a resource centre and shelter for the women of Strathroy and area.

On Monday 19 November, a resource centre offering counselling, information, education, referral services, speakers and a lending library was opened in the town of Strathroy.

A shelter for area women will be opened next year. Currently, there is no shelter available to rural women between Sarnia, Goderich and London.

I would like to recognize the previous government's efforts on behalf of battered women and applaud the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues for ensuring that the funding and support for the vital work to stop the hurting for assaulted women and their children, both urban and rural, will continue.

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr B. Murdoch: I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Health the disinterest in proper health care facilities by the previous government in my riding of Grey. Although there is a similar situation in Hanover, the Meaford General Hospital stands out as a classic example of discourteous treatment given to my area.

The Meaford General Hospital's expansion was approved for funding in 1986 and the community began to raise money to fulfil its part of the agreement. The project, which began in 1988, was put on hold by the ministry. In 1989 they were told their planning had to change direction.

A year ago, they began the major undertaking of rewriting the project, as requested, with an emphasis on community involvement. They included day care, ambulatory and outpatient services.

They presented their revised plans to the former minister on 16 May, more than six months ago. To this date, they have heard nothing.

As the minister will understand, the people of Meaford are confused and discouraged. They have met the government's specific requirements and their efforts have not been acknowledged. Fund-raising results have suffered and declined, yet the expansion is vital to the health of the community.

The present minister can take no blame for the shortcomings of her predecessor. However, I am hopeful that by bringing both these cases to her attention we can

assist in this instance and prevent future situations of this sort.

FIRE PREVENTION

Ms Haslam: I want to inform the members of the House that Sunday 7 October marked the beginning of the 68th anniversary of Fire Prevention Week in Ontario.

As members will appreciate, since the House has not been sitting, this is the first opportunity to reaffirm our support for fire prevention and public safety in the home and at the workplace. In particular, I want to recognize those who have demonstrated outstanding initiative and ongoing commitment to fire prevention.

This government is committed to ensuring that the message of fire prevention is conveyed throughout the province. To recognize the initiative and dedication of members of our community, I wish to introduce the 17 recipients of the 1990 Ontario Fire Prevention and Public Education Awards.

The winners are: the city of Brockville, the Markham Fire Department, Beaver Lumber of Markham, the Ser-toma Club of Chatham, the Rotary Club West of Oakville, the Brampton Fire Prevention Association, the Rotary Club of Sarnia, Chubb Fire Security, Eveready Mississauga and the Toronto Fire Fighters War Veterans' Association.

Individual achievement awards are presented to Fred and Betty Brooks of Chatham and Charles Harris of Caledonia.

Our media award winners are CKCO-TV's Romper Room, the Canadian Statesman of Bowmanville and Skyline Cablevision's Information Gloucester.

These recipients are present in the gallery, and I know that all the members will want to join me to extend their appreciation and congratulations to each of these distinguished guests.

1350

Mr Sterling: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: While we appreciate the announcement made by the previous member, it is quite improper for a member of the government benches to make a statement on behalf of a minister in private members' statements.

I just want you to note our objection to it, not in terms of this particular statement, because we are fresh into the game and if they had sought unanimous consent to do so, we would have even allowed any member to make that statement, but I do believe that the ministers are given 20 minutes in order to make their statements and that they should be done during that period of time.

The Speaker: First of all, the Speaker appreciates the point of order that is raised and I will be communicating with the House later on with respect to the point of order. The member may well be aware that if the member for Perth is a parliamentary assistant, then she may not make such a statement as she did. However, if she is not the parliamentary assistant for that particular ministry, then any member is at liberty to make a similar statement. However, I have listened carefully to the member's point

of order. I will review it and I will be reporting back at my earliest convenience.

Hon Miss Martel: On a point of order, if I might, Mr Speaker: There was some great confusion on our side today, there is no doubt about it. I have apologized to both of the House leaders and it will not happen again in future, but I apologize to all members of the House for this happening today.

The Speaker: That is very much appreciated.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I would like to provide the House with information about amendments to the Employment Standards Act that I will introduce this session. I believe these amendments will make an important and positive difference to the lives of working parents and assist in our government's goal of equality for women workers.

Our government believes that mothers and fathers should have the right to stay home to care for their child following birth or adoption and they should be able to do so without fear of the loss of their job.

The amendments I will bring forward provide natural and adoptive parents with up to 18 weeks of unpaid leave to care for their child with the right to return to their job on completion of the leave. This leave is in addition to the 17 weeks of unpaid pregnancy leave and job rights already provided in our legislation.

For example, in a two-parent family, a natural mother now will be entitled to 17 weeks of pregnancy leave plus 18 weeks' parental leave. The father will also be entitled to 18 weeks, so between them the two parents can provide a total of 53 weeks' care for their new child.

The proposed amendments reflect the government's commitment to helping working families. They come at a time when it is increasingly necessary for both parents to work. The proposed changes will allow working parents to care for their child. The changes will also more than match the length of time unemployment insurance benefits for parental leave will be paid under the UI program.

Under the federal plan, women giving birth were already entitled to 15 weeks of maternity benefits. Bill C-21 gives parents an additional 10 weeks' payment of basic parental benefits.

As honourable members know, federal unemployment insurance benefits are paid to employees taking leave relating to birth or adoption. But it is the provincial Employment Standards Act that provides employees with job protection while they receive those benefits.

The proposed changes will reduce to three months the time a parent will have to work with the same employer to be eligible for leaves. At present, the qualifying time is just over a year.

We believe that Ontario workers are committed to their jobs and loyal to their employers, but it is necessary

to recognize the changes in the employment patterns in today's society.

Ontario men and women want secure employment, but they also want to be able to plan for their futures and for their families' futures.

The addition of parental leave and the reduction of qualifying time will be retroactive to 18 November, the effective date for the federal changes under Bill C-21.

Seniority and pension benefits will accumulate and life insurance and extended health care benefits will continue during the leaves provided for in the provincial amendments. This change will assist women who in the past have found they lost pension and seniority credits needed when they retired or wanted to pursue their careers.

The employer's right to require a pregnant employee to leave early will be repealed and the provisions of the Human Rights Code will prevail. The code requires employers to accommodate the needs of pregnant employees, unless they can show it would cause undue hardship for the business. The employee must give two weeks' notice before the intended date of beginning leave and four weeks' notice before returning to work.

These amendments are timely and reflect the government's commitment to respond to the needs of women and workers with family responsibilities.

RESPONSES

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS

Mr Offer: In response to the honourable minister's statement, let me first make it very clear that our party is and has always been supportive of harmonizing with changes to the federal unemployment insurance program, especially with respect to family leave and job protection. We think this is a step that is absolutely necessary in marrying job protection with job leave.

Having said that, I must indicate some surprise and some dismay that the minister's first statement is just directed to what is of course a very important area. I think it is important that the minister recognize that we are in the depths of a recession. People are losing jobs each day. There are thousands and thousands of jobs which have been lost in this province, and we need some action in terms of the creation of jobs, not just protecting those jobs. The minister will be aware that 3,700 jobs at General Motors were lost; 93 at Alcan in Kingston; 143 in Whitby; 80 at Delta Faucet in Bowmanville; 230 at Greb in Kitchener.

Though I and our party certainly do support the direction in dealing with family leave and family protection, I must indicate that we are very dismayed that his first speech in the middle of a recession does not create one single job. People need those jobs now.

We are, I must say, as I have indicated, supportive of the initiative, disappointed that there has been no job creation. Much as in *The Wizard of Oz*, the minister is acting like a cowardly lion. He is allowing industry and jobs to leave this province along the yellow brick road out of the province. Get on with the job. Let's create jobs.

Mr Sorbara: I too want to congratulate the minister for saying that he intends to introduce this bill at some later date. His leader, in the throne speech and elsewhere, has said on a number of occasions that he wants his government to be characterized by integrity. I think if the statement by the minister were fully characterized by integrity, he would have said at some point in it that the program he is announcing and the bill that he is introducing were really put together by the previous administration, for a time under my direction at the Ministry of Labour and for a time under my colleague the member for Scarborough-Agincourt while he was the Minister of Labour.

It is something that we all agree must be done in this Legislature. It follows upon what the federal government has done under its changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act and completely harmonizes those provisions. I am glad he is doing that. I am wondering why it is that he does not introduce the bill this afternoon. His statement said, "I will soon be introducing that bill." I note that he makes the bill retroactive, and that is good as well, because these provisions have to be fully harmonized with the implementation of the federal program. This is going to help working women and working men when they adopt children and when the spouse bears a child.

But it seems to me that the minister, who has heard the announcements that I made at one point in this House and the announcements that the member for Scarborough-Agincourt made in this House on this topic, and because of the fact that a bill already exists in the ministry to deal with all of these things, could have simply acknowledged that, could not have stood there and taken credit for this great new program that the new government is introducing and could have presented a bill this afternoon.

We have sat here now for two days and we do not have any legislation to work on. I appreciate that the cabinet is just getting together, and perhaps the legislation committee has not had an opportunity to meet. But the bill is not a complex one. It involves some minor changes to the Employment Standards Act, it provides important guarantees, but working men and women have been expecting this in this province for quite some time. A great deal of consultation was done on the bill. As I listened to the minister's statement, he seems to have acknowledged that he ought not to go beyond that consultation and ought to put into place a bill that everyone agrees is a good idea.

So perhaps later on, in the weeks and months to come when he introduces the bill—I hope it is sooner rather than later—he can acknowledge that this is something that I think probably every member of the House is going to support and that it really is a consensus that this province needs to do this at this time.

1400

Mrs Witmer: I would like to applaud the minister for his announcement today. I appreciate the positive steps that he has taken on behalf of working families in this province and I am glad that they were able to follow the initiatives taken by the federal government. I am glad the federal government was able to lead the way.

However, I certainly hope that the minister will take into consideration that this new legislation will create some difficulties for small business and I hope that there will be some consultation with those people.

I am also disappointed that at a time of layoffs and a serious economic recession there has not been another new initiative adopted at this time.

Mr Sterling: I would like to add my congratulations to those of the Solicitor General to the various groups that have received the Ontario fire prevention and public education awards. In particular, I would like to thank—

The Speaker: Order. Just so we all remember, we are responding to statements, and today we have one statement, and each party of course is allotted the full five minutes to respond to that statement.

Mr Sterling: On the point of order, Mr Speaker: That is specifically why I made the reply at this time—to point out the problem with the minister's statement being made out of order in the original intent.

Mr Daigeler: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: In the previous House, the Speaker had the custom of recognizing past members when they were in the House, and I would just like to ask whether you will continue to follow this pattern and welcome the former member for Scarborough West, who is in the galleries.

The Speaker: The Speaker is certainly prepared to recognize former members. Normally if the Speaker is informed of that, he is always quite happy to welcome former members, and I gather that you already have.

Prior to the beginning of oral questions, I would like to draw members' attention to the tradition which we encourage members to follow, directing their question to the Speaker, who will be listening quite intently, and those who are responding directing their answer to the Speaker, who will be listening quite intently to the answer. Perhaps this will help us to set a decent tone.

ORAL QUESTIONS

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mrs Sullivan: I am really startled by the lack of detail and the lack of a time frame for action which was included in the minister's announcement yesterday. My question is to the Minister of the Environment, relating to her garbage plan.

On this side of the House, we are pleased that the minister has adopted our waste reduction targets and continued the emphasis on the 3Rs. We too believe that garbage can be gold and we have worked very hard to maximize those efforts.

However, with the establishment of her garbage authority for the greater Toronto area, we are concerned that she is starting from scratch again and merely exacerbating an extremely tight time frame. The minister has failed to provide any details regarding the establishment of her authority, the appointment of a chairman and its

members, the budget of the authority or any detail of a public consultation process relating to site selection.

My question to the minister is, can she please advise the House today when her garbage authority will be up and running and when it will process its first load of waste?

Hon Mrs Grier: I am sorry I cannot give those precise answers today, but let me assure the member that my authority will not be starting from scratch. There has been a lot of work done by the Solid Waste Interim Steering Committee, which was established by my predecessor as Minister of the Environment. A lot of the work in preparing for the site selection process has already been undertaken. A lot of investment has been made in that. That effort will not be lost.

It is our intention by way of the authority to regularize, if you will, the work of SWISC, which was not an authority founded on any kind of legal basis. The authority that we are proposing to establish will be done in co-operation with the regional chairs, and I am very pleased to be able to tell the House that I have the co-operation of the regional chairs and will be meeting with them very shortly in order to provide the kind of answers which the member has asked for. As soon as those time frames and details are available, I will be sharing them with the House.

Mrs Sullivan: It is very clear that the minister has herself accepted full responsibility for garbage, and yet it is also clear that the minister does not know when she will have an operational landfill facility for the greater Toronto area. Just yesterday she called the situation a crisis, yet she has made her garbage authority responsible for garbage dumps only.

If reduction and recycling are in fact her real solutions, can she explain to the House why her authority has not also been given the responsibility to implement and accelerate the 3Rs?

Hon Mrs Grier: I think my statement in the House yesterday made very clear the priority that this government is going to give to the 3Rs. The mandate and exact construction of the authority, as I have previously said, has not yet been determined because I do not want to do that unilaterally. I am going to be working in a partnership with municipalities across this province on the 3Rs and I know that I am going to have that kind of co-operation.

What we will be doing, in contrast to earlier plans, is making sure that the tipping fees and the revenue generated by the disposal of what waste remains are in fact reinvested in the 3Rs. We will be doing that with firm and aggressive and decisive programs from my ministry, in contrast to some of the actions that have been taken in the past.

Mrs Sullivan: I am interested that the minister has indicated that her consultations will be across the province, because in fact her announcement yesterday addressed only the waste crisis in the greater Toronto area. Since her government has assumed responsibility for the garbage crisis across the province, can she tell the House

how and when her announcement yesterday will assist other municipalities, such as Windsor-Essex, which are facing garbage crises in their communities?

Hon Mrs Grier: I am sorry that my statement obviously lacked some clarity for the member. My statement began by announcing this government's commitment to the 3Rs, a commitment that extends across the province. The assistance, the direction, the leadership will be given to municipalities from one end of this province to another, not merely in the greater Toronto area.

The other initiative that I announced yesterday was an acceptance by this government of the discussion paper and the comments that had been generated by my predecessor with respect to some of the shortcomings in the Environmental Assessment Act. The amendments that we will be introducing and the improvements that we will be making, building on that consultation, to the Environmental Assessment Act will obviously apply not just in the greater Toronto area but right across the province.

1410

Mr Sorbara: My question is also to the Minister of the Environment regarding her plan to solve the garbage crisis. The minister's own statistics indicated that some 4.3 billion tonnes of solid waste are currently being generated in the greater Toronto area. Assuming that the minister is successful with these plans, and I hope she is, in meeting the reduction commitment of 25%, she has now assumed full responsibility for finding a home for over three million tonnes of garbage annually, so a garbage gap exists. Without consulting the people directly affected by existing landfill sites, such as Keele Valley in my riding, she has arbitrarily condemned these citizens to more garbage.

Yesterday in this House and last night on television, she said that she was prepared to use her emergency powers to make those sites stay open after they had reached capacity. Just three months ago, her leader stood on the site in Maple and made a solemn commitment that there would be no extension without a full environmental assessment.

Will the minister not embarrass the Premier? Can the minister confirm that she will conduct a full environmental assessment before allowing the expansion of any of the existing sites, or will she just exempt Keele Valley and the others, as she has recently done by imposing an emergency order on the Wasaga landfill site in the northern part of the province? She should not embarrass the Premier, I say to her.

Hon Mrs Grier: If that is the question, do I intend to embarrass the Premier, no, I do not intend to embarrass the Premier.

The premise of the member's question was this issue of a garbage gap, which is a phrase that I have not heard before, but I assume the member means the time frame between which the existing dumps are full and the new long-term site is on stream. It is the intention of this government, and that was the focus of my statement yesterday, to make sure we do not have that garbage gap.

We will do that by aggressive and decisive action to exceed the 25% target of waste diversion that was set by the previous government, and also by giving a lot of energy and resources to the long-term search for the long-term site, which will be undertaken by the authority that I indicated was going to be established.

Mr Offer: I want to first indicate that I certainly support the concerns of the member for York Centre about the extensions to existing sites, and indeed the approval process and the consultation that is going to go on with the people in that area. As the minister will be aware, the Britannia landfill site in the region of Peel is currently located in my riding. I can assure her that while Peel is very pleased that it is now absolved of the responsibility for solving the garbage crisis, it is still concerned about how she will deal with the garbage when the Britannia landfill site is absolutely filled to ski-hill proportions by December 1991.

That is reality. We are nearing total capacity of the Britannia landfill site. Members of Peel region were being briefed this morning on the full implications of the minister's announcement. They were advised that the financial implications for the region of Peel could reach in the area of \$100 million due to increased transportation costs, increased costs of paying tipping fees at other landfill sites and the lost revenues to the region that they were currently receiving.

My question to the minister, on the basis of her announcement yesterday, is whether she and her government are able to confirm today that they will provide the financial assistance to the region of Peel, the \$100 million necessary to meet the crisis that she has imposed on them by her announcement.

Hon Mrs Grier: The crisis did not start on 1 October. The problem landed on my desk on 1 October.

Britannia was due to close at the end of 1991 and the cost that the member has indicated would have to be absorbed by the region of Peel would be absorbed because the region would have to bring its waste to Keele Valley.

I am very pleased to be able to tell the member today that the chairman of the region of Peel is aware of the announcement I made yesterday, obviously, and I am looking forward to meeting with him and to having his co-operation in working on just some of the issues that the member has raised today.

Mr H. O'Neil: Notwithstanding the government's best efforts to increase the 3R efforts, there is a garbage crisis in Metropolitan Toronto and the greater Toronto area may require additional landfill sites.

The previous government directed the communities within the greater Toronto area to find an interim solution within their own boundaries and a willing host site for the long term. By eliminating the interim sites, which she did in yesterday's announcement, she absolved the communities within the GTA of any responsibility to find new landfill sites within the region.

Will the minister confirm today that communities like Marmora, Warwick township and Flamboro are not can-

didate sites for Toronto's garbage? I ask this question especially concerning the very strong statements she made to the TNT, Take No Trash organization, in Marmora, and to the Minister of Agriculture and Food during the election.

Hon Mrs Grier: What we did by our decision yesterday was to reject the interim process that had been established by the previous government, because we thought that process was not in the best interests of the environment. What the previous policy did was to take shortcuts with the approval process, while on the other hand refusing to accelerate the reduction process. What this government is going to do is accelerate the progress towards real waste reduction and waste reuse. Any long-term site for Metro's excess waste or the GTA waste will be subject to the full environmental assessment process.

INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO

Mr Harris: Yesterday the Premier, in response to my question about anything in the throne speech that would entice business to locate in Ontario, thus creating jobs in Ontario, made great light of the \$700 million that his government is spending on infrastructure. This was an announcement that was in the throne speech. It was a very specific announcement and was touted very proudly yesterday as the answer.

I wonder if the Premier could tell us today where the \$700 million is coming from to pay for that infrastructure.

Hon Mr Rae: Mr Speaker, I think the Treasurer should answer that question.

Hon Mr Laughren: I thank the Premier. To the leader of the third party, I think it is a fair question. There is no doubt that most of these projects will be started and completed in the calendar year 1991. Of the cost of \$700 million, most of that will come out of the 1991-92 budget or fiscal year. There will be some that will come out of the 1990-91 budget year, but it will not be a lot.

I think the leader would appreciate the fact that by the time you make the announcement of the specific projects and get them going—we want that to happen very quickly. I might add that because we anticipate the recession to be primarily in the calendar year 1991, by the time we get them off the ground and going, by the time we start paying for those projects, it is after the beginning of the fiscal year on 1 April 1991.

Mr Harris: I did not ask when the Treasurer was going to pay the \$700 million. I thought I was quite specific. The Premier asked me yesterday to be very specific and we would get specific answers. The question is, where is the money coming from, not when the Treasurer is going to spend the money. Now, I would assume that unless the Treasurer has come up with a new way, there are three ways, three possible sources of this money: \$700 million of new taxes, \$700 million added on to the deficit, or the Treasurer is going to cancel \$700 million of other programs. Could he tell us which of those three.

Hon Mr Laughren: I suspect that the leader would not be surprised to learn that it is going to be a prudent combination of those three.

1420

Mr Harris: Can you tell us which of those three it is?

Hon Mr Laughren: It is a bit simplistic to imply that it is one or another of those three. When we bring in the 1991-92 budget, there will be detailed in that document the way in which we will be paying for programs and also details of our borrowing program, and details of course of any tax changes. So I do not think it is a mysterious process, but that is how we propose to do it.

Mr Harris: I appreciate the Treasurer's answer. It was very clear in the throne speech that somehow or other this is what must be done. He has identified the \$700 million. I want to be clear today that he has said he will do all three. He will raise taxes; he will cut other programs; he will increase the deficit to pay for it. Can he tell us if he has any idea which of those three is going to bear the brunt of it, or did he just make the announcement and say, "We'll figure it out in a year from now when we have to pay it"?

Hon Mr Laughren: First of all, I know the leader is a fairminded person and he would not want to put words into my mouth that I had not said. To be fair, I did not say that we were going to pay for it by raising taxes. I said that it will be paid for by a combination of tax revenues that flow into the consolidated revenue fund and by any borrowing that the province does and by constraints on existing programs.

I do not think there is anything unusual about that, and for the leader of the third party to stand in his place and say that I said we were going to raise taxes in order to pay for the \$700-million program is simply not fair. I said that we will, in the normal course of events, pay for the \$700-million program in the normal way that we pay for programs around here: a combination of borrowing, taxation and expenditure constraints. I do not see anything mysterious or unusual about that.

Mr Harris: I thought the original answer was quite upfront and straightforward, and I was prepared to accept that. Now what he is telling me is that he really does not know how he is going to pay for it; that he will just announce it and worry about it later. That is the traditional way it has been done for the last five years, but it is not good enough for the people of Ontario. It is not good enough.

FOOD CONTAINERS

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. I think the minister will recognize this box that I am holding as a container that was used for packaging by McDonald's Restaurants. McDonald's has now announced that it will ban this packaging in all its restaurants in Canada as part of its fast-food packaging.

I would ask the minister if she agrees with McDonald's decision that it is helpful to the environment

to ban this type of packaging, and if she does, recognizing there are far more fast-food restaurants in this province than McDonald's, does she have any criteria for these other restaurants and any guidelines for them that they should be following in this province as well?

Hon Mrs Grier: Let me tell the member that I do agree with McDonald's, and I applaud its action in cancelling the use of those clams, I think they call them. Tomorrow morning I am going to be meeting with the class of schoolchildren who I think initiated the action. I am going to be meeting with them because I want to emphasize that the war, the attack, the efforts to reduce waste that this government has initiated are not just on the part of the government; we have to involve consumers. Consumers, with their dollars, have a great deal of power, and if consumers begin to say to packaging companies, "We don't want that amount of packaging," I am sure they will respond as has McDonald's.

It is certainly my intention to work with industry to make sure that happens, but if it does not happen and if it does not happen fast enough, we will not hesitate to regulate.

Mr Harris: I am pleased the minister agrees with the decision on behalf of McDonald's and I agree with her in giving credit to the students who brought this issue to the fore in the timetable.

I also have a second container that I would like the minister to look at, a sort of a clam-type package. To give the minister an idea of the size of it, this container as well holds a hamburger. This container, though, is a little different.

Interjection.

Mr Harris: No, it is the same size of hamburger, as a matter of fact.

The difference is that this environmentally troublesome package does not come from a fast-food restaurant. This comes from the legislative cafeteria. I wonder if the minister can explain to me why McDonald's is so far ahead of the government cafeteria and of the Legislature in meeting the environmental concerns we have with that excess packaging.

Hon Mrs Grier: I think that is a very good question. I took some pride as a member of the opposition in making sure that disposable cups were no longer in the opposition lobby. I am glad they are now no longer in the government lobby. I certainly take your point that we have to be leaders in greening this province and it is certainly my hope that we will not be able to get those containers in the legislative cafeteria very shortly.

Mr Harris: Yesterday the minister stood in her place and gave us a great speech, and a great lecture to all industries and all individuals, people in this province, about recycling and reducing and reusing. Yet it is obvious to me that we are still not practising what we are preaching right here in the Legislature itself, and it falls on all of us because this building is one that falls under

the jurisdiction of our newly elected Speaker and all members of this Legislature.

Politicians have all kinds of environmental solutions for everyone else. Would the minister agree with me that we cannot expect others to be following all the preachings that we give them until we clean up our own act ourselves? Will she give us a timetable for this kind of packaging and other environmental initiatives that she and the other ministers are talking about, when you look at the single-pane windows in this Legislature, when you look at the other energy-saving devices?

Hon Mrs Grier: I absolutely agree with the member. I think we have an obligation and a responsibility to be as environmentally conscious in our daily lives, in our offices and in everything we do, as we expect anybody else to do. I have already been asked by the Chairman of Management Board to share with the members of this caucus some rules on how to green your office.

The Speaker: I appreciate both the question and the comments by the leader of the third party and am pleased to advise him that this comes under the jurisdiction of the Speaker and he will be reporting back to the House on this matter in very short order.

1430

Mr Eves: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Is it going to be your idea that from time to time the Speaker is going to answer questions directed quite properly to ministers in this Legislature?

The Speaker: The member, I think, knows full well the position of the Speaker and his role and responsibility. I listened quite intently to the question and the comments by the leader of the third party and recognized that the subject he brought to the floor of the House is one which comes under the direct responsibility of the Speaker. It is the Speaker's intention to follow through on the suggestions made by the leader of the third party, which suggestions, I take it, are generally the wishes of the House in its entirety. So I will be responding to the House as quickly as possible.

Mr Elston: On the same point of order, Mr Speaker: It seems to me that the question itself was in the process of being answered by the minister. She alone can choose not to or point out that the question is not in her bailiwick. If she determines that she wishes not to answer and says it should be addressed to the Board of Internal Economy or to the Speaker, then I think that is okay, but I think it is unusual indeed that the Speaker would stand in his place to interrupt an answer given fully and freely of her own volition by the minister. I would hope perchance that we could get a very early understanding that if ministers are proceeding in order, under the standing orders, to answer a question put to them, they be allowed to complete their answer to the House.

The Speaker: It is never my intention to interrupt any member of the assembly without just cause. If I interfered with the minister, of course she has my apology. I brought it to your attention because it seems to me that

one of the principles of the Speaker is to inform the House as quickly as possible of matters which affect the House, and that is what I attempted to do.

We will now move on to questions.

NORTHERN HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Phillips: My question is to the Minister of Health. I think she will appreciate that most people found the throne speech quite surprising in that it made virtually no mention of health, either in specifics or, frankly, even in terms of the thrust the government plans to take. I must say that the people of Ontario, particularly those involved in the health area, are looking for direction from the minister in terms of her goals. Over the next few weeks, I will be asking the minister questions that will help to bring out those goals, and I would like to start today with the people of northern Ontario, who are anxious to know her plans for the health care system in northern Ontario. My specific question is, can we expect and can we get a commitment from the minister that she will be announcing those plans before our Christmas recess?

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I would like to thank the Liberal Health critic for his commitment to help me enunciate the health goals of this government.

In terms of the serious problems which still exist in northern Ontario in the health care delivery system, I would like to let him know that I will be addressing each of those concerns in an itemized way over the next few weeks and months. I cannot promise I will produce a total picture that will paint a heaven on earth in northern Ontario for health care services, but I will address myself earnestly to the needs that exist there and work towards the goal of providing equality in health care services for our northern members, as members of the New Democratic Party have always done.

Mr Phillips: I appreciate the answer. I might say to the minister that she is no doubt aware that six of her cabinet colleagues studied this matter in some considerable detail. It is not as if it requires more study. In fact, I think the conclusion that was reached in that report, which her leader tabled here in the House, suggested a couple of things. It says, "The members must appreciate the fact that what is needed is action, not further review and study." So I can appreciate that she is looking at other areas, but in this particular case I think her colleagues spent 18 months studying it. I think they outlined in detail the blueprint they promised to the people of the north. I do not think she needs more study. What I am looking for is a commitment by the minister that she plans to implement what was promised in this study conducted by six of her cabinet colleagues, including the Premier. As I say, in this particular case I think she might have to move more quickly than she had planned to.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: Certainly the member is correct in saying that the studying has been done. The question of addressing each of the items which need to be addressed in the north will be undertaken by this minister and by this government over the next several weeks and months.

I have already had several contacts with people in northern health services, both informal and formal. We will continue having those contacts and building up a reserve of knowledge and information about which priorities we should be addressing first. I will be looking for quick action on the elements of northern health care policy which need to be undertaken now and should have been undertaken long ago, let me point out.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr Cousens: I would like to commend the Minister of the Environment for her acknowledgement yesterday that we face a crisis in waste management. There are a number of concerns that I would like to address.

In yesterday's statement, the minister stated she would be suspending the Environmental Assessment Act exemptions for the Whitevale and Brampton sites. Does this mean that she will be reversing the exemptions announced by the former minister, and if so, when will they be announced in the Ontario Gazette?

Hon Mrs Grier: A letter is being prepared that will be sent to the board. I confess to being unfamiliar with the process of how they get gazetted. But I will be indicating that the hearing scheduled for 26 November should not continue.

Mr Cousens: What I would like the minister to do is also confirm that she will reverse the order of the previous minister on those two sites, and that will mean that there is not going to be a possibility of a dump site there without there being a full environmental assessment. There is still a chance and, unless she acts on it in this way, we are going to be concerned that there is still that likelihood. The dancing in the streets last night really might not have been worth while.

Another question to the minister: She also stated that she would be asking Metropolitan Toronto and Peel region to delay final closing of the existing sites and that she would be using her emergency powers under the Environmental Protection Act if necessary. This was referred to earlier today. Is the minister telling this House that she is prepared to bypass the public hearing process for landfill expansions? Does this not fly in the face of her election commitment that the public must be involved in determining landfill extensions?

Hon Mrs Grier: Let me clarify the situation with respect to expanded capacity should there be an emergency. Let me make it very clear that I do not expect that there will be an emergency, that I am fully confident that the plans I announced yesterday of expediting the search for a long-term site and moving aggressively on reduction of waste will avoid the need for interim sites.

I think it would have been irresponsible of me not to acknowledge the possibility that there could be an emergency. I felt it was important to make it very clear from the outset that in the event there is an emergency, I would be prepared to use my emergency powers to make sure we did not have garbage piling up in the tennis courts, landing on the fields and all of the things that have been

done. I would do that by using my emergency powers to keep open and expand Keele, which is an existing site; if that was not sufficient, Brock, which is an existing site; if that is not sufficient, Britannia, which is an existing site. Should there be an even more extreme emergency, which I do not for one moment anticipate, then the initial work that had been done on the two greenfield sites of 6P and P1 would be work that might make it possible for us in an emergency to use those sites without the full benefit of an environmental assessment. But it is not my intention to get to that point.

1440

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Ms Haeck: My question is directed to the Minister of Government Services. I know that the people of St Catharines will be happy with the decision by this government to decentralize. I would like the minister to elaborate on the proposed move of the Ministry of Transportation to the Niagara region. It has been announced in this House that the move is going forward, but I know that the city of St Catharines would like more information. Will the minister expand on her remarks of yesterday?

Hon Ms Lankin: Yes, the move will go ahead. As the member knows, an issue of great concern to this government is that of preservation of agricultural lands, in this case in particular, preservation of tender fruit lands below the Niagara Escarpment.

Therefore, in the letter I sent to the mayor of St Catharines, I detailed that we would be consulting with the community with respect to a number of items but, in particular, the exact location of the building. I am sure the member can understand that the building of a new head office to house up to 1,400 jobs and the potential influx of a number of new people to the area may give rise to concern about placing stress on the tender fruit lands.

Additionally, I think that in the letter I indicated that we would consult with concern particularly to environmental issues, preservation of the fruit lands and concern with the regional plan, as I understand it, which directs development to above the Niagara Escarpment. Therefore, the exact location of the building will come about as a decision of the result of those consultations.

Ms Haeck: Could the Minister of Government Services at this point provide my constituents with an idea of the implementation plans and at the same time address the issue of fairness to employees?

Hon Ms Lankin: In the original announcement that had been made by the previous government, the St Catharines move was designed to be completed in 1996-97. Over the next three to four months we will be completing a review of the complete implementation and timing. We may well be in the position, once we have decided on the final location of the building, to move some jobs in advance.

We will be looking particularly at the issue of a human resource package. The member may be aware that when the announcements were made in June and July, there was no announcement of how employees of the government would be treated under this move. We will be working with senior management, managers and the bargaining unit with respect to assistance in relocating employees and their families; also with respect to placement of individuals who will not be relocating, retraining, those sorts of initiatives, the cornerstone of that being a job offer guarantee which is similar to the previous government's northern Ontario relocation program human resource package.

RENT REVIEW

Ms Poole: My question is for the Minister of Housing. First of all, let me congratulate the member on his elevation to cabinet. I think members from all sides of the House will truly agree that there is no one more deserving of the portfolio. Tenants have been calling my office in confusion about conflicting statements made by the New Democratic Party as to its rent control policy, and certainly the incredibly brief mention of housing in the speech from the throne on Tuesday did nothing to help. I would like the minister to clarify which of the following two statements are correct.

The first statement comes directly from the NDP's An Agenda for People, which was its campaign platform: "New Democrats would bring in rent control. That means one increase a year based on inflation. There would be no extra bonuses to landlords for capital or financing costs."

Perhaps the minister would just take a look at the second statement, which is from the Financial Post on 8 November 1990: "In a significant policy reversal, Ontario Housing Minister David Cooke now says that the New Democratic Party government will permit landlords to charge higher rents that include costs of capital improvements to their buildings."

Will the minister tell me which statement is true?

Hon Mr Cooke: After being minister for six weeks, I think I understand what the member said at the beginning of her statement. There is a plot to get even with me by somebody out there.

I appreciate very much the member's question and I want to indicate to her that the purpose of our review and the announcement that we will be making as soon as we possibly can will be very clear. It will have one objective, and that is to clean up the mess that we have in the current rent review system.

Both landlords and tenants in this province understand very clearly that the rent review system is not working. It is simply not working, and it will be our objective to bring about a fairer system. But the basic principle in that system will be one that I am sure the member agrees with me on, and that is that tenants have to be protected against unconscionable rent increases in this province.

Ms Poole: That is something I can certainly agree with the minister on. I think our goal is to protect the tenants of this province.

But I would remind the minister that the wait and the uncertainty are creating great anxiety. Tenants are confused about what the minister is going to do. At the same time, landlords cannot even borrow money from the bank to effect repairs and maintenance. The situation cannot go on.

Would the minister please tell us right now, today, the date when he will be announcing his policy on rent control?

Hon Mr Cooke: I would like to be very specific but I can tell the member it will be very soon. Tonight I will be meeting with the Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario. I have been meeting with tenants' organizations and landlords' groups. I am sure the member would also agree with me that part of the process of developing a policy has to involve consultation. That consultation is taking place.

As soon as I have an announcement to make or as soon as there is an announcement that can be made, we will make that announcement, but I can tell the member, and I reinforce, that tenants of this province will be protected under NDP legislation.

FARMERS' INCOME

Mr Villeneuve: In preparing his speech from the throne, the Premier is obviously not aware that realized farm net income was forecast to be down again this year, for the third year. Realized net farm income this year will be lower than in 1989 and 1988 and indeed will be lower than it was in 1983. After allowing for inflation, it will be lower than it was in the last 15 years.

The government has announced plans to raise the minimum wage and yet, in agriculture, workers are getting less than the minimum wage at present. How much lower do farm incomes have to go before the government gives them a little bit of parity with our urban citizens?

Hon Mr Rae: I think in the circumstances it would be appropriate for the new Minister of Agriculture and Food to answer that question.

Hon Mr Buchanan: I would be very pleased to answer that question. The member may know that we have been consulting across the province with a number of farmers and farm groups, and the member has identified the number one problem for farmers across this province. We have talked about solutions. One of them is perhaps for consumers to pay more money for food, and that has been reported in the press.

The problems facing the farm community, though, in some ways go beyond the farm-gate price. We have problems in the farm community with credit. We have fluctuating interest rates which are driving farmers out of business. We have problems associated with securing loans in order to put crops in. There are a number of problems associated with credit, and we are addressing the credit issue very directly.

My parliamentary assistant is going to be conducting a number of hearings across the province to address the farm credit issue. In the spring, we hope to be able to

announce some solutions to the farm credit problem. The solution in terms of commodity prices is a much larger one that requires.

1450

Mr Villeneuve: I thank the new minister, and congratulations. However, he does have a major problem, and income and the stability of farm income is the major problem facing him and his government.

We must bring in new programs to counteract what is happening in other countries and in other provinces. Our producers need action for a strong voice, and there have been recommendations for one strong voice. We need an answer from the minister. Our producers need an environmentally beneficial fuel ethanol policy, which is win, win, win for the producers and for the consumers. When can we expect initiatives that will address these very real problems and at least send a signal to our agricultural community, which is getting very low prices for its commodity now, that this government is willing to extend some form of assistance?

Hon Mr Buchanan: In terms of the ethanol issue, I would like to report to the member that if we can show that burning ethanol or producing ethanol from corn has a net energy gain—in other words, we do not spend more energy in producing a bushel of corn to provide ethanol than we get out of it from the ethanol itself—then we will move ahead with ethanol and we will talk to our federal counterparts in terms of introducing legislation that will make that a possibility.

On the issue of commodity prices and protection, one of the things we are going to do to try to protect the commodity prices that are decent in the province today—and those are commodities generally that are produced under supply management—we are going to GATT to try to protect prices of those commodities such as milk and eggs and chicken. We are going to try to protect the farmers in that sector. We need to do more in other sectors, I would agree with the member, and we will be working with farm groups and individual farmers to try to address that problem over the life of this government.

BUSINESS PRACTICES

Mr Owens: My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. As the minister is aware, there was a draft consultation paper on consumer and business practices circulated in July 1990. I would like to know what the status of that paper is.

Hon Mr Kormos: I cannot tell the member how pleased I am to be able to answer that question, because indeed in July 1990 a draft consultation paper was released. We applauded it when it was released by the previous government. We recognize the hard work that a whole lot of people put into preparing it, but when I saw it once again after assuming my position at the ministry, I said, "This simply isn't good enough for an NDP government," and we intend to do better. So we are reviewing it with that in mind.

Mr Owens: Keeping the minister's comments in mind, I would like to ask the minister, what specific improvements is he looking for in this code?

Hon Mr Kormos: A whole number of things that the previous government clearly did not think were important enough for consumers here in the province of Ontario. We want to look at plain-language legislation so that people other than lawyers can understand contracts and agreements that consumers enter into. We want to look at a requirement here in this province that new cars have to carry the retail price sticker so that consumers know what they are buying and how much they are paying when they are buying what is for most people the second most expensive investment during the course of their lifetimes. We are looking at the prospect of a new car lemon law so that we can get tough on behalf of consumers, rather than roll over and deliver them to the manufacturers and the wolves that would prey on them. We are engaging in consultation with the community and with the members of this assembly to prepare a consumer protection code that will be the leader in North America.

FOOD BANKS

Mrs McLeod: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. The minister will be aware that on Monday of this week the Anglican diocese of Toronto and the task force on food banks made a very clear statement that direct funding of food banks is inappropriate and should not be reinstated. Bishop Terence Finlay said quite firmly that the problem we are dealing with is not hunger, or even a lack of food in food banks; the real problem is poverty. Jennifer Harris of the task force on food banks presented a number of recommendations which would represent an immediate response by government to a complex problem of great urgency.

Can the minister tell the members of this House how she will respond to these recommendations and whether she will move quickly to implement each of them?

Hon Mrs Akande: I am very happy to answer the member's question. We are in fact looking at emergency measures to address the needs of the food banks. In fact, I am meeting this week with a group of very distinguished and well-known people who have led these food banks for quite some time. We are, in fact, addressing the problem.

Yesterday I spoke of the long-term measures which speak to the food banks. But the member is quite right—the issue is poverty. The issue is, as I said yesterday, interministerial, and the response, in a long-term way, will be dealt with by all the members of this ministry to in fact solve the problem of poverty in this province.

Mrs McLeod: I am pleased to hear the minister make reference to emergency measures because while, as I indicated yesterday, the talk of long-term plans is important, it is obvious that promises and plans are not going to feed hungry people. But the discussion of emergency responses also gives me a certain cause for concern, because the Premier has in the past been very critical of the Liberal

government's decision to eliminate the emergency shelter and assistance program, a decision which was made only after it had been shown that social assistance reforms had in fact had a very immediate effect on food bank use. This criticism continued throughout the August election campaign.

The Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, last March questioned whether the social assistance reforms could in fact have changed the demand for food. His continued criticisms would lead us to question whether the Premier doubts that social assistance reforms can eliminate poverty and the need for food banks, or whether perhaps support for such fundamental reform is not likely to be forthcoming in time to deal with a very urgent situation. May I simply ask the minister, does her government intend to reinstate direct funding for food banks?

Hon Mrs Akande: Let me say clearly that this government intends to respond to the emergency needs of food banks, not by funding them, but in a way which will in fact put food in those people's mouths, yet work in a way so that we do not further institutionalize food banks.

RENT REVIEW

Mr Tilson: I have a question for the Minister of Housing. We listened to the member for Eglinton and watched her cue cards, and I am afraid the question that was asked still has not been properly answered.

I would like to say that we certainly all agree that there is a great deal of confusion surrounding the government's rental policy. An Agenda for People did state that an NDP government would bring in rent control with no extra bonuses to landlords for capital and financing costs, yet now the throne speech states that the government will revise rent review.

On 8 November the minister reassured landlords that the realities of the marketplace have forced him to seek a system which would please landlords as well as tenants. Yet three days later at the annual meeting of the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations, he told tenants that the legislation would deliver on his party's election promise.

Will the minister stand in the House today and clear up all this uncertainty by telling the people of Ontario what measures his government intends to introduce to deal with rental housing?

Hon Mr Cooke: I would like to indicate that the member is correct on all counts. We are going to be fair to landlords and we are going to offer proper protection to tenants across this province. We have indicated all the way along the line since the current legislation was passed that we did not support the current rent review legislation. We opposed it when we were in opposition, we opposed it during the election and we oppose it after the election because it is unfair to tenants and it does not offer enough protection to tenants.

We said before the election, we said during the election and I am telling the member today, we are going to bring in a system of rent control that offers real protection for tenants.

1500

Mr Tilson: I understand the minister voted against the very legislation that he is trying now to revise. Given speculations and concerns in the rental housing industry, will the minister confirm or deny that he intends to introduce a moratorium or freeze on all outstanding applications in the system while the government figures out what to do, and whether any future changes will be retroactive?

Hon Mr Cooke: What I will confirm to the member is that we are working and consulting with landlord and tenant groups across this province, and as soon as the consultation process is over, we will make an announcement in this House of how we are going to offer real protection and rent control for tenants.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr McGuinty: My question is for the Minister of Energy. I will take this opportunity as well to congratulate the minister on her recent election and elevation to the cabinet.

In a letter signed by the Premier, dated 14 August 1990, to the major provincial environmental groups, including Greenpeace, the Premier stated that the NDP supports no nuclear reactors in Ontario and a phase-out of existing nuclear reactors. My question to the minister requires a simple yes or no answer, and it is this: Does this government intend to honour this promise?

Hon Mrs Carter: Unfortunately, when we came to office the situation was as we found it, not as it would have been had we been the government in previous years. The electricity supply of this province was already 50 per cent nuclear and billions of dollars had already been spent on the construction of further nuclear facilities, that is to say, the Darlington stations.

In view of the fact that these stations were 80 per cent completed and \$12.5 billion had already been spent, we decided that the only sensible thing to do was to complete them. We could not phase out power stations which in fact were providing, as I said, 50 per cent of the province's power.

However, we feel that our emphasis on conservation, energy efficiency, the bringing in of independent suppliers of energy and the development of other hydroelectric stations will give us a very good margin of energy supply, so that we do not need to initiate the building of any further nuclear power stations.

Mr McGuinty: I am new to this House, but trying to understand the answers given to questions by the members opposite is often like trying to grab smoke.

In the throne speech, this government stated that it was placing a moratorium on nuclear power facilities in this province. There can be no doubt that the question of meeting Ontario's future electricity needs is an important one. That is why the former government set in motion an environmental review process strengthened by intervenor funding, an independent review of Ontario Hydro's options to meet our future electricity needs.

My question for the minister is this: How long is this moratorium going to be in place? In particular, I ask her whether this moratorium is to survive beyond the completion of the environmental assessment hearing which is to review Ontario Hydro's demand-supply plan.

Hon Mrs Carter: As members know, we are continuing the environmental assessment process as originally planned. We feel that this gives the people of this province a chance to make their feelings known and it gives us the possibility of having a thorough exploration of the whole issue. The moratorium, however, is not limited to the duration of the inquiry. I believe some of the media have reported that it was for three years. It is an indefinite moratorium. There is no time limit on it. We have every confidence that our policy of energy conservation, efficiency and, as I said before, the bringing in of parallel power developments will make the development of further nuclear power stations unnecessary in the foreseeable future.

MOTION

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr Eves: Mr Speaker, I believe we have the unanimous consent of the three parties. With respect to the Orders and Notices paper of today, page 4, the special debate with respect to opposition day, because of standing order 41(c), we no longer are able to change the date by which that opposition motion is to be debated. I believe we have unanimous consent that it be changed to read: "Notwithstanding standing order 41(c), to be debated on Thursday, November 29, 1990. Treasurer of Ontario."

Mr Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

FINANCIAL CONSUMERS ACT, 1990

Mr Chiarelli moved first reading of Bill 3, An Act to provide for the Protection of Financial Consumers.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Chiarelli: The purpose of the act is (a) to require suppliers, agents and financial planners to disclose to consumers important information about named financial products; (b) to inform consumers that they have responsibilities as well as rights when they invest in named financial products; (c) to set standards for financial planners and to provide for their licensing; (d) to make remedies available so that disputes about named financial products can be resolved efficiently and effectively, and (e) to encourage the use of readily understandable language in the financial marketplace.

CONYORK CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING LTD ACT, 1990

Ms Poole moved first reading of Bill Pr18, An Act to revive Conyork Construction and Engineering Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

1510

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr Nixon: I am honoured to have the responsibility once again of leading off the opposition comments on the legislative agenda put forward by the government of the day.

While I am here in a recycled capacity, the Premier and his colleagues are there for the first time, as they have told us so often. Perhaps it would be appropriate, having been a long-time observer of the conduct of the affairs of the House, if I were to say that I have been quite satisfied with the responses of the Premier and his colleagues in these two question periods. I feel that both opposition parties have put a point of view and have elicited some information and some guarded responses, a little bit of condescension, which I suppose we can understand when we realize that power corrupts, although we did not expect the disease to penetrate quite so deeply by the second day.

I should tell you, Mr Speaker, that in my lighter moments I expected the government to collapse by Christmas, but I am now thinking more in terms of Easter. I also want to say that we are looking forward to many interesting question periods and exchanges of views as the work of the province comes before the House.

I have also already congratulated you, sir. I do not want to reiterate that other than to give you our assurances etc. But I was taken by reports of your comments outside the House in which you indicated that the larger numbers of women elected to the House would have some sort of leavening effect which might lead to a kinder, gentler approach to the discussion of public affairs. I am sorry if I may be paraphrasing you improperly, but I did feel that this generalization would surely not reflect your own experience in previous incarnations here. You may remember our mutual good friend Sheila Copps was on some occasions moved to express a view rather clearly and persistently.

But one of the biggest changes, of course, is in the present Minister of Health. I have had the good fortune to be associated with her for a number of years, particularly when she was a researcher, commentator and interviewer for CBC radio and television. I have always known her to be incisive but I have also known her to be—I suppose there are a number of adjectives, but the one that comes to mind is "aggressive," perhaps "prickly." I have a feeling that the present Premier, in interviewing the prospective members of cabinet, right at the very desk in the office I presently have the honour to hold, must have woodshedded a number of people. I can see him having a discussion with the present Minister of Health and saying, "Evelyn, you're great, but cool it off."

I hesitate to discuss in any great detail the discussion he might have had with the present Minister of Financial Affairs, because I think he has been very subdued so far in the House, although I was glad to see him on his feet today. One of the areas of concern I have is that so many of the initiatives that the minister in charge of car insurance will be carrying is the postponement of any initiatives in this connection.

I can tell you that I, along with all the people of the province, had been looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to the speech that we heard read by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor the day before yesterday. It may not surprise you, sir, that I was somewhat disappointed when—and perhaps I will give you a slow pitch—it was very much like the other speeches I have heard over the years. It was very long on principle, some homily, quite a lot of motherhood, if you want to think of it that way, apple pie, and there is another adjective that I will not use in this House, sir, because even you might interrupt the flow of the debate.

The disappointment really lies, of course, in the vagueness of the approach. The people of the province certainly expected the election of our first socialist government to come forward with an innovation. Frankly, I expected perhaps that the program of the government would not be put in the mouth of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, who might have been asked simply to open the House and call on divine guidance, which certainly the government of the day needs, and leave it to the head of the government to put forward—in my view, it might be a more modern practice in a Legislature—the position of the government.

I have always found it a bit awkward when views expressly relating to the political position of one political party are required to be read by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. That is our tradition. People think of me as a traditionalist and I do not mind that, but I would certainly suggest, perhaps to this Premier's successor, one of my friends, that such an innovation might be undertaken.

I know also that perhaps people related to the New Democratic Party had hoped for a kinder, gentler Legislature, the paraphrase of George Bush's hopes, along with "a million twinkling lights" and "read my lips" and those things that he has added to the lexicon of political quotery. It has ended up in this Legislature that we are asked to be kinder and gentler.

As everybody knows in this House, I have always had those attributes, have always been willing to cede the floor and be as agreeable as I possibly could be. But my colleagues and I have an important responsibility as well, one that most people who understand the democratic system feel is as important as the responsibility of the government.

It has changed slightly in that frankly, number one, looking at the conduct of our affairs in this House, the first responsibility is to see that every day the House sits for an hour we and the other members of the House put questions without notice to the members of the government, which they are required to respond to as they see

fit. The people viewing on television and in the media gallery and the people in here make their own judgements and in the long term add these judgements up as to whether the government should receive the continuing support of the electorate.

I do not intend to dwell on the history of this, but certainly a few years ago, when I first became a member, there was no question period. Actually, because of that, even during the debates that would go on through the rest of the day and usually three or four days a week into the evening, most of the members of the House would be present.

I think the honourable members who are newly elected may be disappointed to find if they stay in the House to listen to a debate like this, and I appreciate the fact that a number of them have survived at least the first five minutes, they will find themselves quite lonely. Cabinet ministers particularly, who have a lot of pressure on their time, and I know this to be true, will be expected by their officials and certainly their political advisers to get themselves back to the office and start doing whatever it is cabinet ministers do. I vaguely remember.

I appreciate the fact that people are here and I hope that, as we move into the work of this session, it will be possible for an actual debate to take place on legislation and various resolutions and that the question period itself will not be seen to be the only thing that happens.

Some honourable members may recall that we have adjusted the rules and modified them substantially, so that the debate can involve members, and at the end of each speech—except for the formal leadoff speech, I should warn members—it is quite possible and in order, and in fact very desirable, that honourable members will get up and question the speaker, and if they do not want to question, make comments, naturally usually in support of the comments, but they could be otherwise if that were the decision.

We have to criticize. Question period is important. I am very impressed with what we have put forward with the Conservatives and the private members. It is working very well. I do not want to be presumptuous to judge, but I think it is working very well. Also, it is our job to criticize. There are those who say opposition members hear a speech from the throne and immediately say it is vague etc. That is true.

They say, "Why don't you just say it's all good?" We do not believe it is all good. We do believe that An Agenda for People, which was the program upon which the New Democratic Party received the responsibility of government, has been largely ignored, that those important social programs, which I am sure the main supporters of this party have been looking forward to, have really been put in a subparagraph indicating that over the next five years these important matters having to do with social programs will be dealt with.

1520

One of the things that concerned me early in the question period was the estimable, newly appointed Minister of Community and Social Services, in response to my

colleague our critic, indicated that it would take her at least three months to clean up the mess that she inherited, which really means, I guess, that the people who are hungry and ill-housed and who have been the subject of so much direct criticism are going to have to continue that for at least three months until the honourable minister gets her act together.

There was a certain degree of condescension in that particular answer which concerned me, because the idea that may have somehow accrued to the New Democratic Party that it is the only one with knowledge or concern in this regard is incorrect. Some honourable members know perhaps how personally sensitive I am about that myself, and while there are a number of keys that can turn on my mild irritation, that probably is the principal one. So I look forward to discussing it perhaps in more detail as the government program comes forward three or four months from now, and perhaps we will take it as our responsibility to see that the minister and her officials get right at their big cleanup program and bring forward their solutions.

We had the strange impression, I suppose, that they had some solutions: that they knew about automobile insurance; that they knew about the environment; that they knew about northern development; that they knew about education; that they knew about all of these areas which now they are "studying." They think by using the magic word "consultation" that they are going to be home free. Some of them think that consultation is all there is to it. I will tell them, the more they consult, when they finally decide, the more people will say they did not consult. Many people think consultation is agreement. Just a warning, because they will find out about that.

Governments must lead. They must get whatever information they require to make a decision, but the government's approach, with the vast array of consultative measures that it has talked about, is going to delay the action that the electorate expected from this brave, bushy-tailed group of socialists who find themselves, as they say, for the first time on the inside.

The implication, I guess, is that everybody else is on the outside, and this concerns me very much and leads me to say something that sometimes pushes the button of the Premier, and this is something that I may return to, that is, this halo complex, the fact that unless you are a social democrat or a democratic socialist, somehow you do not have any conception of what the community needs or in fact what the responses should be.

So we have to criticize and we will do so, and we hope that our criticism is constructive. But that is not always possible and it is not always the proper thing to do because the government, with the resources of the disinterested but capable members of the public service, comes forward with a number of alternatives. They will finally make a choice, according to the Minister of Community and Social Services, and we will be asked to debate that and perhaps amend it to some extent.

We have to also ensure community input, and I would say that the New Democratic Party has been good at this in the past, but this is changing rapidly now as well. It

began, of course, with our standing and select committee system, which goes back into the mists of history, where citizens could apply to the clerk of the committee and bring forward their views as long as it suited the members of the committee to hear them. Of course, this is an important basis of our parliamentary process, and going back many, many years right to the founding of this Parliament, the people have always had the right, and they understood that—and who is to deny it—to assemble in front of the building and express their views on certain policies that they may support or they may oppose.

It has often fallen to my lot, as a spokesman for the Liberal Party over the years, to go out on the front steps and not always receive the 100% approval of those people present, and I know what that is like. It is certainly the responsibility to be there, just as, I believe, in a democratic society those people who are expressing their views should have the right to out what the alternative views are as well.

We must ensure community input and involvement. The last one concerns me. I have been persuaded that the opposition has the responsibility to stop legislation it considers to be bad. I did not use to think that. I used to think that in a Parliament, the government of the day had the right and the responsibility to present its program, it had the right to have it fully debated and it had the right to have it decided democratically.

My own experience is that the opposition put forward by the present government party, the New Democratic Party, was the most obstructionist that I have experienced in 27 or 28 years in this chamber. There is no doubt in my mind that the endless repetitions of reading petitions and filibustering has interfered with the course of the public business of Ontario in a way which, in my experience, was irresponsible and unconscionable.

I say that to you, Mr Speaker, because you have indicated in your leadership and direction of this House that it is your intention to see that every member has his or her opportunity to express a view, and of course these things will eventually be settled by democratic vote.

My experience is that this has not been the example set by the present government party. Most people would forget something that I shall never forget: that, as Treasurer of the day, I was even prevented from reading the budget of the province to this House by the obstructionist NDP opposition. So when you give me any stuff about being kind and gentle, please remember that it would be a breakthrough on the part of the opposition party, not following the example of the government party, and I want to make that clear.

I think also, and I say again, that we do share the responsibility for making this chamber function. If we get into a position where acrimony divides us on issues, then I believe that it is wrong. I believe that it is important to debate the issue strongly and with a background of information reflecting the views of the community wherever possible, but always accepting the responsibility to express our own views, not just the views of the pollsters and something along the same lines to express our own

views, not just the views that somebody has placed in our hand by way of a script.

There is an interesting rule in here, Mr Speaker, that you are aware of and that some people wish I would not observe quite so carefully, which is that we are not supposed to read a speech. In fact, if people are reading speeches, they come to a more rapid conclusion. I just indicate that some members may wish that I were reading a script today. But I think it is important, particularly when you look at other parliaments, many of them unruly, many of them based on the same legislative parliamentary procedure background that we accept, which are able to conduct their business with people expressing their own views, not just those views that are placed in their hand.

I do not want to be condescending or presumptuous; I just simply say to all of us as members and even to the Minister of Community and Social Services, who is looking so scornfully at me at this moment—and I sense that she has no trouble expressing her own view—that it is important that we are here to speak for ourselves and not really for anybody else. I am going to end up my speech a few minutes from now by returning to that comment.

There is no place for acrimony; there is room for good, tough debate and even to have an enjoyable time. I was just thinking that I mentioned other parliaments. It is interesting to note, for example, and maybe the Premier would note this as well, that in that Mother of Parliaments at Westminster, they were able to shed a Premier by just lifting an eyelash. Prime Minister Thatcher, highly regarded around the world, went away to a conference and, almost as if she was president of Upper Volta, came back to find that she was out of office.

What a marvellous flexibility in the parliamentary procedure there would be. I suppose that applies to opposition party leaders as well. So anybody who thinks that by observing the Parliament at Westminster we are mirroring our thought processes in even more amber must realize that in fact in many respects this Parliament, this Legislature, is probably slower to evolve than others.

1530

We have a series of prohibitions here that are in a sense honoured in the breach. You, Mr Speaker, pointed up one today, "Please address the chair." We will not talk about that; it is good advice. There have been a couple of slipups in the rules. The honourable House leader mentioned it. Our own House leader has commented. The Conservative House leader, ever alert, is there. So we have lots of people safeguarding those things.

One of the prohibitions is the use of the word "liar." It is in many respects the ultimate parliamentary obscenity. You cannot work in a Legislature if you truly believe a person with whom you are debating is a liar. So almost any other word can be used here, even the words that my kids use. Those words are okay here, but you cannot call a member a liar, and if you do you are out. I can recall that the honourable House leader's father, an estimable friend, and I had a contretemps about this. As a matter of fact, it held the House up for about three days.

Hon Mr Wildman: Elie did that?

Mr Nixon: Yes. It would be an interesting debate to look up if they want to see some of these things. I simply mention it because, as I move slowly through my remarks, I want to come to the election campaign. You can understand, Mr Speaker, why for good reason I do not want to dwell on it, but it began with a press conference involving the present leader of the government. Having read the transcript, I can see what happened, but the headline was, "NDP Leader Calls Premier Peterson a Liar." I found that so offensive—

Interjections.

Mr Nixon: If they did not, then they do not know what I am talking about and I cannot help them but I can pity them. I think they would know this if they actually read the exchange. This happens to everybody, to politicians in a press conference, that the press kind of chivvy you: "You mean to say you think he is a liar, blah-blah-blah?" "Yes," he said, "I have to say he is a liar because he did not keep a political promise."

Can you imagine that, Mr Speaker? Something that Premier Peterson had said in a campaign, he did not do after the election and the leader of the present government called him a liar. Well, nobody else found that offensive in the House, at least on that side, but I did, and I just want to tell members why I found it offensive.

In July 1990, the Leader of the Opposition: "If Varity, in whose creation the governments of Ontario and Canada were deeply involved, is now permitted by means of some settlement to move its headquarters to the United States, what does that say about the Liberal government's approach to industrial policy? It clearly says there is no interest in defending anything. We can't let the whole economy be swept out beneath our feet." On 18 October 1990: "Premier Bob Rae approved a package deal which allowed Varity to move its head office to Buffalo, New York."

A quote from the Leader of the Opposition, March 1990, on Consumers' Gas, "It should be a public utility, publicly owned." The Premier, 7 November 1990, "It makes economic sense to approve the sale."

I am not going to use the example set by the present leader of the government, who used the word that the people on that side, by their interjections and comments, do not worry about, because I do not use that word and I do not believe he is a liar. I do not believe that. I know he is not, just as I know that David Peterson was not and is not a liar. It is just a clear indication, however, of where politicians can be led in the exuberance, I suppose, of the moment. I do believe, however, that the public out there—it has been the New Democratic Party more than anybody else—is becoming cynical. They are wondering about our politicians and they are feeling that with the election of the NDP, here is a party that is not going to engage in that sort of thing. They believe that and it is great that they do.

I just want to tell members that I believe there has to be an acceptance of the motives as being useful and directed towards the improvement of provincial politicians on all sides. Members may get sick of me

preaching about it, but this is surely the occasion, as we begin a new Parliament, where, from my point of view, it is worth saying.

I have a high regard for the Premier. Some of the things that I have said about him and that I may say about him later in this speech are critical. That is what I am here for. That is what I am paid to do. My colleagues are paid to do the same thing for this government and offer alternatives. That is my job. I want to be personally critical of the Premier in using that word at that time and under those circumstances.

I was also appalled, frankly, at the response of the media as if, okay, Fighting Bob comes out of his cage. The lesson there may have led to victory, but if that was one of the reasons then I feel a little more comfortable in defeat.

I am interested to know that the people who responded to unkept promises in this regard were not too much upset. As a matter of fact, my own view is that when they look at *An Agenda for People*, many of the people who voted for the NDP, in some instances against the Liberal candidate, are hoping that the government does not keep all of its promises. Not everybody is either a social democrat or a democratic socialist. The government finds itself in office with a special responsibility. It has an opportunity to bring forward its philosophies and its concepts, but it also has the responsibility to assess what is said in this House and to act accordingly. It has a full majority and can do as it wishes when it gets to the point where the House decides, by its vote, its approval or otherwise. But that responsibility is special in its circumstances.

The comment by the Premier that is not quite in the class I have already described that I want to talk about was, and I believe he said: "What can I do? The cupboard is bare. They didn't leave us a nickel in the till." I have to say something about this—

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I bet you do.

Mr Nixon: —because I am the person who stripped the till, according to the Minister of Health, who is coming to life. The till is a remarkable one. It has a cash flow on a daily basis of about \$125 million. If one wishes to do it on a business day, five days a week, my rough calculation is about \$180 million a day. So there are a couple of nickels there.

It is true that our budget, my budget, previous budgets have allocated a good deal of this to expenditures over which governments have little or no control. But a new government can set its own priorities. If you think too much is going one place and not enough to another, by flicking your eye or the Treasurer doing whatever he does over there, these things can be changed.

I was interested in the exchange with the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, when the Treasurer was asked where the \$700 million was coming from. That is a relatively easy answer. It is about three days' revenue. That is what it is. As a matter of fact, in his budgetary comments he indicated that part of the unallocated additional money he needs for this year's budget is going to

go to pay doctors. He said he did not want to tell us how much that was of the almost \$800 million unallocated that he put in the budget on behalf of the taxpayers this year, but there is some indication that it would be at least \$300 million. He did not want to be specific, because of course somebody in the government is dealing with the doctors in a new pay arrangement.

Perhaps I should not reveal any secrets. I do not have any to reveal, other than to say that as I recall, in general terms, there is about \$200 million or \$300 million or a number in that area already in the budget for that purpose.

It is interesting to note, when the honourable Treasurer is criticized by the Conservatives about the \$700-million fund to cover the whole of the unemployed in the province of Ontario, that as I estimate it there is at least \$400 million that the Treasurer has given himself to deal with the doctors. It is interesting that he puts those in those particular categories. I will deal with that in a moment.

1540

I want to talk about the budgets because in 1989-1990, the budget that concluded last March, we had a fully balanced budget. We did not plan it that way. I wish I had. The revenues that came from many, many sources were well above and beyond the projections that came from the economists and fiscal experts, the same ones, and very, very good people they are, who advise the present Treasurer.

More money was there. We pre-flowed some, as somebody pointed out, for school capital and hospital capital, and still we were able to pay all the bills including all the capital in one year, the first time we have had a balanced budget, a fully balanced budget—the Premier commented on that very appropriately—in 20 years. We even had enough to pay down the provincial debt. The last time anybody did that was George Drew in 1948. We actually reduced the provincial debt by something around \$400 million. I was very proud of that.

Then we went on to this present fiscal year. The economists who work for the Treasurer, whoever he or she may be, have to make judgements and provide advice, and they indicated that the rate of economic growth would slow down but that there would still be positive growth—no recession. They listened to Michael Wilson—and why should they not?—who said that interest rates would come down to average 11.15%. In the event, the average was very little below 14.5% and it has just moved a bit below 13% more recently. They brought forward the recommendations that were in the budget that the present Treasurer criticized rather effectively during the debate at that time, but nobody indicated, as I can recall, that those projections were unnecessarily optimistic or pessimistic.

At the time, we had hoped that real growth in the province would continue and that we would in fact be able to pay the bills and have a very small surplus, estimated originally at \$30 million. By the end of the first quarter, at the end of June, the report came. Just about the end of July the estimates from the fiscal experts was that the surplus would be reduced and would be about \$23

million. They indicated welfare costs were going up and revenues were going down.

Many things were happening at that time. Oil prices were changing. The interest rates, because of the Bank of Canada policy—the Premier has commented on that—were staying well above 14%. Bankruptcy rates were going up. Revenues were dropping and there were many, many changes occurring.

As a matter of fact, it was not until the newly elected Premier asked for a fiscal review that the number was first made public that we might in fact be in a \$700-million budgetary deficit—I point out, a huge amount of money, as a matter of fact the total amount of money that the government has allocated for special job creation. I think it was estimated at about 4.5 days' revenue. Not that we should go in and correct and go back to some arbitrary, rigid balance, but at that stage it could have been done if there were an arbitrary, rigid Treasurer or anybody who felt that somehow that balance had to be maintained.

I simply want to tell members that this particular approach is one that is not uncommon, and just as the rate of growth was well beyond what the economists projected over the last three years, so the rate of descent and the collapse of the economy was well beyond what the economists, both in the Treasury of Ontario and the experts around the country, particularly at the federal level, had projected.

At the end of the second quarter, the Treasurer did what I do not blame him for. He decided to look around in the government—I know he would have quite a bit of help doing that—to find areas where bills could be paid and dumped into this pot, as I mentioned, and hang in a few albatrosses around the neck of those nice guys who were going out into the wilderness. I do not blame him for doing that.

It is true that under the Urban Transportation Development Corp contract, going back four years, we had to fulfil the contracts and pay the money for the shortcomings in the specifications of a large number of very, very expensive public transit systems that were sold by the previous government, so it turns out of course that those Conservative guys are responsible all the time, either they or Michael Wilson; I forget which.

That bill, very appropriately, was paid this year; there is no reason why. We had planned to pay for it when all the bills were in, and I did not want to take on an extra \$400 million of expenditure this year. Why should I? It can be done next year, and that is an appropriate time.

The Dome situation: We could talk about that a lot. I expect one of our committees will be looking at that and the experts can come in and talk about it, but for the Treasurer to say, "Gosh, I've got \$300 million to pay off on the Dome at the same time we are having Bob White"—Oh, he is not up there today—"go downtown and do a number on these businessmen and intimidate them."

Interjection.

Mr Nixon: Bob White intimidates me.

I have a feeling that the Treasurer, who should have learned negotiations at the feet of the Steelworkers or somewhere, somehow did it rather strangely when he said: "Oh, Senator Eyton, I've \$300 million here and we're going to fix this. How much have you got?" It is a very strange way to do business.

To put it in this year's budget is really inappropriate, so what he did was he found revenues were down \$1 billion. There is no reason to question that. I hope that the revenue slide is not beyond that, and it may very well be, because the economy is changing very rapidly.

However, according to the Treasurer, expenditures are up \$1.5 billion. Social programs are escalating for reasons that we might very well debate in the House some other time. Certainly they are largely associated with the economy, but there are other reasons that are very disconcerting. Presently, according to the more recent report, they are up \$360 million over the projections and I am afraid they are going to be much higher than that.

Then the Treasurer said: "I need a contingency fund. A lot of things are not looked after in Nixon's budget. There are the doctors. God, we have to fix those without delay. There's the Dome situation. There are others."

As a matter of fact, he put this on my poor quivering shoulders and set it out in his Ontario Finances for the end of the second quarter. At least he did not mislead anybody; he just said, "Contingency fund, \$743 million." In other words: "I'm not sure what this is. I have an idea but I don't want to tell you. We need another \$750 million," which I called a slush fund.

Somebody in the gallery said: "Slush fund? You wouldn't call it that, would you?" Listen, there is nothing illegal about a slush fund. It is just a handy wad of money that the Treasurer has to spend when he wants to. And why should he not ask for it, particularly if he can give the political bill to somebody else?

I thought it was worth while saying this because I meet Liberals around the province and their eyes avert because somehow or other I left some kind of a fraudulent \$2.5 billion.

Hon Mr Laughren: That's not fair.

Mr Nixon: I appreciate the rather sardonic interjection of the Treasurer, because to give him his due and there is a lot due in this regard, he did not needlessly capitalize on this situation.

It would have been so easy, and it was so easy for others, to say: "Whoa, what are we going to do? Not a nickel in the till. The cupboard is bare. How can I build the opera house? How can I buy Consumers' Gas? How can I increase social payments? How can I pay more money to schools? The cupboard is bare."

The cupboard has a new \$180 million a day, and the government has the responsibility to establish its priorities. That is what the members opposite wanted. The people have decided to give them that responsibility and it is our job to observe what they do and to point out effective and useful alternatives, and that is what we intend to do.

I will just say—I probably get needlessly defensive here, because after all I am interim, like a brightly coloured maple leaf falling down in the fall—that nobody was misled. The civil servants did a good job. Our fiscal position is excellent. The NDP government decided to add on at least \$1.5 billion. The Liberal government left it with the only double Triple A credit rating in Canada, and now it is their baby and we want to see what they do with it.

I referred to the recession and the unexpected speed of its onset, almost onslaught. Eleven thousand jobs have been lost in the last two months; I hesitate to say since 1 October because even I am not prepared to blame the new government for all of those difficulties.

I applaud the allocation of an extra \$700 million for job creation. I was interested to see that great Liberal, the mayor of Toronto, say it was just excellent and he could not wait to add some more money from Toronto, and the Treasurer recently said that the fund will grow to \$1 billion for job creation. Apparently, there will be about 14,000 jobs, according to the comment made by the Treasurer. We look forward to that, even though he said that, however fast they will get these under way—and I understand it would be relatively the same shelf of programs that has been available in the Treasury and that he does not expect to have to pay for many of them until next year—we are a little worried about that time scale.

1550

Mr Speaker, I think you should know that in the budget that is presently the basis of the conduct of our fiscal affairs, there is about \$3.2 billion of capital works. These are already under way. They involve many environmental programs; they involve new roads and bridges; they involve northern development, schools, hospitals and all sorts of municipal structures—by far the largest capital program in the history of the province.

These additional jobs are welcome but they will do very little to help those who are laid off in manufacturing, the resource industry and the agricultural industry. The honourable member, who I do not believe is in his place, but who was asking questions on agriculture this afternoon—

Mr Villeneuve: He is right here.

Mr Nixon: Noble, sorry. I thought his question was very good.

From our point of view, our position was to have a very large capital works program, \$3.2 billion. A program for decentralization was certainly one of the cornerstones to assist many communities which are single-industry or very cyclical in the economy to offset the depredations of this recession. These 6,000 recession-proof government jobs would certainly be a boon to these communities, and I am very glad indeed that the present government has decided to go forward with that and I appreciate the comments made by the honourable minister in this regard.

However, and the point was made by the leader of the third party yesterday, there is no program for the attraction of additional capital to the province in the creation of

jobs, and this is certainly something we will want to see worked on by the Treasurer, particularly as he accompanies the Premier to New York and Tokyo, perhaps London, the capitals of the world, in conveying the fact that the Premier is so concerned about: That in fact we do not have a socialist government here at all, that we have a party that was socialist when it came up to the election but is now the friend of big business, that big business can trust it, that in fact the Premier's new friends are in Bay Street and Wall Street. This is something that must give a lot of people downtown a feeling of relief, because far from the socialist impact that the Treasurer used to talk about, and he still believes this—and I challenge him to challenge me, as he raises his fist clenched in this House—he still believes that the resources—

Interjections.

Mr Nixon: Mr Speaker, since our antiquated rules governing television do not permit the cameras to pan, I think the people would be interested to know that the Treasurer was banging his shoe on his desk in the finest tradition of Marxist-Leninism.

I am not sure that the Premier is going to take Pink Floyd with him wherever he goes, because a funny thing happened on the way to Wall Street. They stopped the big limousine with the smoked windows. The Treasurer got out with a couple of his minions and insisted on going to the Bronx to see the depredations of rent control, and that is why the landlords feel that there is hope for them yet.

But when it comes to the fears of the business community, the business community has said, and it appears in the business press, that the Premier is intelligent—we all know that—and that he is a capable person—we all know that—and that business people do not have to worry about it. After all, he let Victor Rice take his boodle and go to Buffalo; he let his friends the Reichmann brothers sell off the biggest natural gas utility we have here and take the money back to England to invest it. So they say, “There isn’t a socialist government here”—that is for sure—“it is a pussycat government.”

It is a government that is so afraid that its new-found business friends might not approve that it has done what politicians must never do, and that is change its spots, bend over backwards, do all of these mixed metaphors that really mean that the people who thought they were electing a socialist government—maybe feared they were electing a socialist government—do not have to be afraid of that any more. Nothing wrong with that.

Mr Speaker, you will be glad to know that I am getting through my notes rapidly.

I appreciated the fact that the honourable member raised the questions on agriculture. We support his concepts. I think it was because I was going to speak about it this afternoon that I would indicate my agreement.

I have had the opportunity during the last two months to do a little farming for the first time in a long time. Some of the people around home were glad that we are starting a small cleanup campaign. But we got out the mouldboard plows—the Minister of Agriculture and Food

might object to that—and got back in the fields and did some plowing.

When I was presented, for example, with the bills for plowshares, for some tractor repair, for sprays—God help me—fertilizers etc, I was amazed that the situation on the farm, which I was aware of and had been reading about, had depreciated so rapidly. We are corn producers on our farm. I am just quoting a paragraph from the November-December issue of the *Corn Producer*:

“At-harvest prices of \$100 per tonne, far below true costs of production of even the most efficient, are bad enough. But this fall we have seen an inordinate increase in these costs of production: for example, increases in propane prices of at least 50%, coupled with very high at-harvest grain corn moisture percentages, necessitating greater propane uses for grain drying, much higher fuel costs for harvesting and fall tillage, higher fertilizer prices caused by demand from offshore buyers.”

The honourable member in his comments talked about net farm income in Ontario. The net farm income in 1990 is forecast at \$837 million, a decrease of 27% from 1989, and the rough average means that working farmers earn about \$11,000 each from their farming operations.

I simply point this out to the members of the government and the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I have not congratulated him on his appointment; I do not even see him here. But this is an area of policy that is going to have to be dealt with in a way that is much more specific than the words in the speech. The words in the speech from the throne said, “to improve programs to stabilize farm incomes.” If they are stabilized at their present level, the agriculture industry is dead. The words were ill chosen.

I wish—and this is an instance that I referred to earlier in my remarks—that I could say we have the easy solutions. Obviously we do not. I could recount to the House the initiatives taken by my colleague the member for Timiskaming and by Jack Riddell, who were Ministers of Agriculture and Food over the last five years, in supporting farm income through interest supports etc, but even during those years, net farm income continued to drop.

The honourable member for Middlesex in her speech yesterday very properly pointed out that sometimes the only refuge financially for farmers is to try to sever a lot. It is interesting. In my farm community of South Dumfries township, if there is a severance of a farm lot of a reasonable size—and I do not mean a small lot; I mean an acre or an acre and a half—that is in any way desirable, that lot is worth \$100,000.

1600

To a farm family that is probably in its fifth or sixth generation and that has always had plenty of money to send the kids to agriculture college or whatever they felt they should do, had enough money to trade their car occasionally, had money to maintain their equipment—even in latter days a few would occasionally spend a long weekend in Florida—what has happened to them is that, really, they have been totally left out of our modern economy.

The idea that is certainly widespread among intelligent people in this House that we have to stop the severance of any land for anything other than the production of food has simply further cut off the access for any saving revenue they might have. With the views expressed by members of the New Democratic Party government, that planning must further be centralized and in fact the decisions will be made more and more by nameless, faceless bureaucrats at Queen's Park as to whether this sort of development at the local level will take place, the farmers are certainly abandoning that even as an alternative.

So there is going to be a good deal of discussion of important matters here, but I would say to the Treasurer that the free fall of the farm economy that has certainly been experienced during this crop year is something that is going to have to call for his full attention.

I should say something just in passing. Our family has grown wheat every year since the people originally bought the land at a good and fair price from the native community and, according to any records we have, this was the best crop we have ever had. The price is roughly comparable to what my grandfather got in 1937 for wheat. In other words, the more you grew, even though it was the best crop ever, the more money you lost. This is tough. If it were in any other area of the economy, there would be outrage.

I was not even going to raise this, but people keep sending us stuff in the mail. There was a memo that indicated that some people in the New Democratic Party who are concerned about this are concerned about most other issues well ahead of the farm economy. I think it is important that I say something about it. I do not think I have to declare my interest as a farmer, but I should tell the members that the House is going to have to come to grips with this.

I was not going to spend much time talking about specific areas of social policy, but the minister, in her comments yesterday, stimulated me a bit in this regard. It goes back to something else that I have already indicated I am sensitive to, which is the feeling among many members of this House that the Liberal Party is not sensitive to these matters and that during five years we did not respond to it.

I think the honourable members would be aware that Ministry of Community and Social Services spending during our five years moved forward rather dramatically. Last year, the increase alone was 16% overall at a time when federal support was limited by the initiative of a federal Conservative budget that is presently being tested in the courts.

I am proud of the fact that it was our government that instituted the Social Assistance Review Committee report. When the recommendations came before the government, I think it is generally known that I was one of the less enthusiastic about moving forward with the recommendations. Since these decisions are collegial, they were taken, and we accepted 80 of the recommendations for a cost of \$415 million above the standard cost plus inflationary cost.

This was a very large and dramatic increase in expenditure. It meant that our social programs were—I hesitate to use the word “generous,” but the payments were the largest, however inadequate they were, of any jurisdiction in Canada in the large area of basic payments covering most of the people the Ministry of Community and Social Services deals with. I believe this means they were the best in North America, however inadequate they were and are. The idea that somehow some heartless, redneck farmer-Treasurer kept this tied down to the point where the programs did not go forward is simply not true and I would be very surprised, if this government lasts five years, if its record of commitment of public dollars will exceed what we did during the last five years. There are many areas that we are proud of having accomplished: The increase in the number of child care spaces exceeded 60% and we doubled the number of subsidized spaces.

Perhaps the thing I am most committed to and most proud of is the policy on long-term care, which certainly was approved by the government and made public and envisaged an increase of expenditure of \$2 billion over the next six years. I am very anxious that the review that the government would undoubtedly be undertaking in that regard would result in an announcement, because I think it is the most important step forward taken in this area since medicare itself. Certainly I am a great believer in the importance of that program and I trust that the government is not going to delay its implementation.

I will just say in passing that I am very interested in the Premier's initiatives in constitutional reform. We know what is happening in Quebec. We know about Mr Mulroney's citizens' forum. The Premier was good enough to say to the leader of the third party and myself that he wants this as devoid of partisan politics as possible and has undertaken to keep all of us as members of the House fully informed. I think he can rest assured that the debates in this House will be of the same high calibre as they have been in the past. He himself, of course, took a leading role in these matters as Leader of the Opposition. I think many people are wondering what Ontario intends to do as they see other jurisdictions, the federal and provincial governments, moving forward to organize themselves in participation for what may be one of the most important debates in the history of our country.

I would also like to say that I was interested on opening day to meet so many people who are not necessarily Liberal but whom I have come to know reasonably well and admire over the last five years. A picture of six or eight of them was, I believe, in the *Toronto Star* today. They were sitting in the second row of the gallery, and they are the principal labour leaders in the province of Ontario. Three of them, I believe, were—are—members of the Premier's Council on technology, so I got to know them there. Certainly I got to admire their contribution, which was not partisan but very much useful in establishing the goals for the allocation of provincial resources in making employment and keeping the economy growing.

But I had a feeling when I looked up there at my friends Leo and Bob and the others that they had a belly-

ful of canaries, that they were looking at a government that they considered theirs. I have expressed this concern before. The feeling that somehow the people who the members of the present government considered to be outsiders are now insiders, I say again, is unacceptable, because those people always had the ear of government and in fact were present at the councils and areas of advice at the very highest level.

It is generally known that the New Democratic Party gets all of its political financing, with the exception of a very small amount, from labour. I think this is a matter that must concern them, because I remember probably at this stage five years ago the then Leader of the Opposition was castigating the then Premier for getting all his money from big business and only responding to that particular side of the economy.

I think there is a balance in this, but there is no doubt that the labour leaders, the bosses of the labour unions, the ones that have the checkoff, that support with that tiny trickle of two or three cents a day that firehoses into \$2 million or \$3 million a year, look on the government as their private property. For example, I like the section on employment and safeguards in there. I remember when similar sections were negotiated by Bob White with the auto industry he was quoted with alacrity that this should become the law of the province. Presto, it is about to be. As a matter of fact, the legislation is pure Bob White, if that is not an oxymoron.

It concerns me also that the *Toronto Star* on 3 November had a report entitled “Labour Wants Say in NDP Policies, Document Shows,” an article by Leslie Papp. The quote:

“An Ontario Federation of Labour memorandum indicates some labour officials want a direct hand in shaping New Democratic Party legislation...”

“The memorandum obtained by the *Star* urges labour to help draft government policy, not just express an opinion.

“Authors of the document also want public funds to hire administrative assistants for labour representatives on Ontario commissions and councils.

“‘The involvement which we are seeking goes well beyond what is usually connoted by terms such as “consultation” and “access.” We wish to be involved in a substantive way in the formulation of new legislation and new programs,’ the document says.”

1610

It is very proper that the Premier, when asked about it, said he knew nothing about it and rejected it, and of course he would. I am talking about the attitude of organized labour in this regard and I want to express my concern. The government very properly has stated that it is there to represent and act for all the people. The danger is there. Who pays the government's political costs? You know. Who sits in the gallery and admires the government's victory? You know. I simply point that out as a warning.

The Premier may feel that his new-found business friends are going to come to his personal support. I think

probably there is a history of premiers who feel, as they go to the lunches in the bank boardrooms and are given the dish of salted nuts and the specially prepared cider and look at the \$50,000 art collection—per picture, that is—of these very interesting and hospitable people, that it is their personality, their technique at the keyboard, whatever it is, that is making them attractive. I just give the Premier the warning.

I really do not have to warn him, because he is a regular guy. After all, he was raised on Embassy Row and he has had the salted nuts and all that, so he is beyond that. But they are not his friends, just as they were not my friends. On a personal basis, I believe they would be. They know where they are going to vote, they know where some of their money is going to go, and our friend the member for Nipissing does not have to do anything but sit back, smile and charge \$1,000 a pop for a glass of ginger ale and what they choose to call hors-d'oeuvres.

So I have to say to the Premier that he and I are out of it. We have a lot of friends there, but there they are. All of us, however, whether we respond to big labour or big business, are approached by big lobby groups. My friends in the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, for example, are well-known lobbyists. They are usually sitting up there, but perhaps they knew I was speaking today. I am a member of a very effective lobby, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. The list is lengthy: the Ontario Federation of Labour, the doctors in the Ontario Medical Association, the municipalities, the lawyers.

They come and talk to us in the consultation, which is right there as the most important thing that any of us do apparently. We spend a lot of time talking to these people and stroking them, being nice and respectful and receptive and being as responsive as we can. But eventually even the Minister of the Environment has to decide and Greenpeace does not like it or the Day Care Coalition does not like it. All that feeling that, "I thought everybody loved me," and now all of a sudden there are a few people who do not. We found out about that in spades.

I think all of us, of course, to do our responsibilities, have got to listen to these people and respond as frankly as we can and then decide with whatever input we have by way of consultation what is best for all. I think we must beware that many of these groups put their demands in terms that, "This is best for the province," and in their view it probably is, but it is a single issue and in some respects very self-serving. That is why the government is hard-pressed to please everybody. The Premier already knows that that is not possible.

I think it brings me perhaps to the philosophical value of liberalism, which has always been doubtful in the minds of some socialists. As a matter of fact, they have often felt that if they wanted to eliminate one political adversary, it should be the Liberals first, because they could deal with the bloated capitalist function. It worries them that in fact we do have a sensitive and conscientious approach to social issues—I do not exclude anybody from that—that we are not directly responsive to organized labour, that we know where we stand with our friends in big business. But we of course are left with the only

constituency that really makes sense in a modern democracy and that is everybody—the individuals. We respond to them by way of our policy. We respond to them by way of our responses in this House and that is why, even though we find ourselves in a small degree of political disarray but with a substantial caucus of capable men and women, 36, that we really have not just the middle ground in policy but we have the foundations of democratic support.

It is on that basis that we are confident, having received a temporary setback, that we will move forward again by working hard, by putting forward viable and effective alternatives, that we will regain the confidence of the people and once again assume the responsibility of office. I hope I am here when that happens, but I can assure members that even if I am not, which is unlikely, it will occur. We look forward to that day.

I want to tell you, Mr Speaker, that we listened carefully to His Honour's words. I read in the paper that you had the legs cut off the throne so that it would be a bit more comfortable, and it may be why, when the Honourable Lieutenant Governor was reading, his knees got in the way of his projection. We listened to the speech carefully indeed and, like many citizens of the province, we felt that there was not a ringing approach to a new socialist nirvana that could be brought in by the implementation of the Agenda for People. We knew much more about what the new government was going to do before the speech from the throne than after. Afterwards, everything was fuzzified.

There is going to be lots of review, even of automobile insurance. Mel Swart has been brought in to help the minister make up his mind. It is typical of Mel Swart, as one of the finest politicians who ever was, that I read he will not take any money for this. He probably will not even get money for gas to come over from St Catharines. He is a great guy that way and I hope that he is more successful than the Premier in keeping the new minister in check and keeping him moving forward in the implementation of full tort, driver-operated automobile insurance. There is a sense already that the government has not quite decided what it is going to do about this and it may even be late spring before it can make that decision.

So there are many areas of concern and inadequacy in the speech that was put forward by His Honour. I would say again that the Lieutenant Governor did an admirable job. He did not even indicate any distaste in the words that were put in his mouth by the Premier for that, and you would have thought that in fact he was born and raised a socialist. As a matter of fact, I think maybe he was. I saw him at the swearing in of the new government, when he seemed to be almost as enthusiastic as Bob White and some of my other friends. But the Lieutenant Governor always does an outstanding job, does it with dignity, and I know that everybody in this House appreciates his work.

So, having expressed some of my views in these matters, which I consider to be of importance in the conduct of our business, having also expressed my dissatisfaction

and disappointment with the leadership that has come from this new government, it is my duty to move, seconded by Mr Conway, this amendment to the motion.

The Speaker: Mr Nixon moves, seconded by Mr Conway, that the following words be added to the motion:

"This House regrets that the new government has failed to put forward a legislative agenda which deals adequately with the issues facing the province, and that this House condemns the government:

"1. for its failure to fulfil commitments made in its Agenda for People, specifically those social reforms which the new government advocated so forcefully while in opposition such as child care, social assistance rates and legislative reforms;

"2. for its failure to respond adequately to the worsening recession, particularly the absence of any initiatives which would encourage new investment and new job opportunities for the people of Ontario;

"3. for its total failure to clearly establish policy priorities and funding commitments in such fields as the

environment, health, education, agriculture and northern development."

On motion by Mrs Cunningham, the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Miss Martel: Before we adjourn, I would like to inform the House of the business for next week, pursuant to standing order 53.

On Monday 26 November, we will continue with the debate from the speech on the throne and the House will adjourn at approximately 5 pm as per consent of all three parties.

On Tuesday 27 November and on Wednesday 28 November, we will continue with the debate from the speech from the throne.

On Thursday 29 November, we will have an opposition day, which now stands in the name of the leader of the third party.

The House adjourned at 1623.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Thursday 22 November 1990

Members' statements		
Regulation of financial planners	2135	
Mr Chiarelli		
Violence against women	2135	
Mrs Witmer		
Toronto Transit Commission safety	2135	
Mr Dadamo		
Government facilities	2135	
Mr Bradley		
Post-secondary education	2136	
Mrs Cunningham		
Use of municipal stationery	2136	
Mrs Caplan		
Shelter for women	2137	
Mrs Mathysen		
Hospital financing	2137	
Mr B. Murdoch		
Fire prevention	2137	
Ms Haslam		
Statement by the ministry		
Employment standards	2138	
Mr Mackenzie		
Response		
Employment standards	2138	
Mr Offer		
Oral questions		
Waste management	2139	
Mrs Sullivan		
Mrs Grier		
Mr Sorbara		
Mr Offer		
Mr H. O'Neil		
Investment in Ontario	2141	
Mr Harris		
Mr Laughren		
Food containers	2142	
Mr Harris		
Mrs Grier		
Northern health services	2143	
Mr Phillips		
Mrs Gigantes		
Waste management	2144	
Mr Cousens		
Mrs Grier		
Decentralization of government operations	2144	
Ms Haeck		
Ms Lankin		
Rent review	2145	
Ms Poole		
Mr Cooke		
Farmers' income	2145	
Mr Villeneuve		
Mr Buchanan		
Business practices	2146	
Mr Owens		
Mr Kormos		
Food banks	2146	
Mrs McLeod		
Mrs Akande		
Rent review	2147	
Mr Tilson		
Mr Cooke		
Nuclear power	2147	
Mr McGuinty		
Mrs Carter		
Motion		
Business of the House	2148	
Mr Eves		
Agreed to	2148	
First readings		
Financial Consumers Act, 1990, Bill 3	2148	
Mr Chiarelli		
Agreed to	2148	
Conyork Construction and Engineering Ltd Act, 1990, Bill Pr18	2148	
Ms Poole		
Agreed to	2148	
Throne speech debate		
Resuming the adjourned debate	2148	
Mr Nixon	2148	
The Speaker	2158	
Adjourned	2158	
Other business		
Orders and Notices	2135	
The Speaker		
Report of Commission on Election Finances	2135	
The Speaker		
Order of members' statements	2136	
The Speaker		
Business of the House	2158	
Miss Martel		
Adjournment	2158	
Lists of members		
Members and their responsibilities	2159	



59 1990

59 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 26 November 1990

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 26 novembre 1990

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938. Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 26 November 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

MINISTRY MAILING

Mr Daigeler: One of my constituents recently sent me a copy of a letter from the Attorney General that makes me wonder whether the minister reads his letters before he signs them. Apparently this letter is being sent to all prospective jurors in the province, and this makes the minister's carelessness all the more embarrassing.

Instead of "trial date," the letter said "trail date" and instead of "thanking" people for their participation, the minister is "thinking" them for their participation. I do not even want to mention the spelling mistakes in the French version.

As my constituent writes:

"At a time when our education system is criticized for not 'producing' individuals capable of reading, writing and spelling, a letter sent to thousands of Ontario residents should set an example, particularly coming from a minister of the crown."

I hope that from now on the Attorney General will heed my constituent's advice, will make drastic changes in his office and will read his letters before he signs them.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr Jordan: Since the outbreak of the Persian Gulf crisis, the people of Ontario have seen dramatic increases in the price of their gasoline. While most Ontarians recognize that gasoline prices reflect world oil prices, they also fear that oil companies have profited unjustly by raising prices before they had to.

The New Democratic Party, when it sat on this side of the House, echoed similar concerns. In 1987, the present Minister of Natural Resources demanded that the previous government "come down on the side of consumers for once and end price gouging at the pumps."

The ironic part of this story is that the exorbitant price that this member was talking about just three years ago was 42 cents a litre, nowhere near the 70-cent levels that my constituents in Lanark-Renfrew are complaining about today.

On 3 October of this year, the Premier promised he would protect Ontarians from unjust gasoline price increases, telling reporters:

"If we find price increases that are totally unjustified and are creating a windfall situation, we have the constitutional power to deal with that. It would require legislation."

Given past articulations of both his party's stand while in opposition and his own promises as Premier, our

Premier seems committed to action. Lanark-Renfrew and the rest of Ontario anxiously await.

GRASSROOTS

Mr Sutherland: I would like to make a statement today on a very active group in my riding known as Grassroots. Grassroots is an environmental awareness group that has been in existence since October 1989. In little over a year they have established themselves as the credible voice on environmental issues in my riding. They have achieved this status through logical presentations based on strong research.

Among the issues Grassroots has dealt with are the following: approaching Woodstock city council requesting a household hazardous waste collection program for the city; convincing Woodstock city council and the township of Norwich to oppose the building of a biomedical waste incinerator based on the fact that Grassroots research has indicated that biomedical waste incineration is extremely harmful to the environment.

Grassroots has also been extremely active in public education about environmental issues through classroom talks, public lectures, environmental fairs, columns in local newspapers and radio spots.

Grassroots membership consists of housewives, professionals, working people and others who are genuinely concerned about the environment. They are successfully fulfilling one of their goals, which is to think globally but to act locally in order to be part of the solution to the global environmental problem.

I want to congratulate Grassroots on a successful first year of activities and hope that it continues to be a shining example of what each of us can do individually to help our environment.

LITERACY

Mr Curling: We speak often about removing the barriers that act to prevent individuals from full participation in our society. One of these barriers is illiteracy. Recognizing this, the United Nations declared 1990 as International Year of Literacy.

Illiteracy is a silent, crippling handicap that condemns too many of our citizens to a life outside the mainstream of society. An estimated one out of every five adult Canadians can be described as functionally illiterate; that is, millions of adult Canadians do not have the ability to read the printed material encountered every day at work, at home and in the community. Twenty-two per cent of our youth who drop out of school are illiterate, and more than 10% of those who do graduate cannot carry out the basic reading and writing skills.

At the forefront of the efforts to promote literacy in Ontario and to make all of us more aware of the costs of illiteracy to our society and to the human spirit are the legions of volunteers in the communities across the

province. This Thursday 29 November 1990, the Scarborough Public Library Board, in co-operation with the government of Canada, will be hosting an awards ceremony to acknowledge the work and dedication of some of these volunteers.

I know that all of the members of this House will want to join me in congratulating the award winners, and at the same time I would like to remind the government that these volunteers cannot win the battle alone. Government must match the commitment of these individuals and groups with a commitment of new dollars.

RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr Tilson: At the annual meeting of the Fair Rental Policy Organization last Thursday evening, the Minister of Housing announced that his government will introduce the changes outlined in its Agenda for People. There will be strict rent controls with no extra bonuses to landlords for capital and financing costs.

The minister, however, did not explain how he intends to deal with the implications of this decision. By removing the provision for capital cost, the minister must now deal with the \$10 billion worth of renovation and repair work that his ministry reports is required to maintain Ontario's aging rental stock. The rental housing industry has already indicated that \$32 million of planned renovation and repair work will not proceed, resulting in the loss of 16,400 construction jobs.

By removing the provisions for financial loss, current building values will decline by 25.7%, according to Professor Andrew Muller of McMaster University. The province will have wiped out \$15 billion in equity.

We share the government's frustration with the current process. This system is not working for either landlords or tenants. But the government's solution does not deal with the central issue of lack of supply. Stricter controls will drive private investment out of the rental market. The maintenance and repair work needed to preserve the existing stock will not be done. The province will be forced to spend billions constructing every new rental unit in the province.

The issue of affordability will not be addressed, since 28% of all tenants will spend in excess of 30% of their income on rents. Other tenants will be protected from large increases in the short term but in time their units will begin to deteriorate around them. In the worst-case scenario, the New York experience will be replicated in our large urban centres. In the South Bronx, hundreds of acres formerly devoted to rental housing are now abandoned.

1340

REST HOMES

Mr Christopherson: I thank my constituents for bestowing upon me the honour and privilege of representing them in this Legislature. The people of Hamilton Centre have a clear message for our new government. They are demanding we provide leadership on a host of critical

issues, issues such as the environment, poverty, fair taxes and the continuing recession.

Notwithstanding these important issues, my first statement in this House will address the plight of tens of thousands of Ontarians who are currently living in rest and retirement homes. These homes are also known as residential care facilities or, in the case of my home town of Hamilton, as second-level lodging homes. It is unacceptable that in the dawn of the 1990s, facilities such as these, providing assistance with the activities of daily living, are still operating largely unregulated.

For too long now, local communities have been left to fill this legislative vacuum as best they could and to shoulder the provincial responsibility for what are in many cases unacceptable levels of care. Ten years ago my city of Hamilton showed leadership in passing the first bylaw in Ontario in an attempt to provide at least minimal protection for these residents. I recommend that our government examine the recent Hamilton proposal in developing these much needed regulations.

NORTHERN HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Micalash: According to Ministry of Health figures, since this government came into office on 1 October, over 570 northern residents have missed out on full, equal access to health care services that were guaranteed to them.

The former government took very seriously its commitment to accessible, quality health care for all of Ontario and worked very hard to ensure that people from the north had the same access to health care services as their southern Ontario counterparts.

In 1985, the former government brought in the northern health travel grant as a short-term measure while it instituted structural changes to health care services in the north. Under the travel grant program, northern patients who had to travel a considerable distance to receive health care services which were not available in their own communities were eligible for financial assistance to cover the costs of these travels.

In 1988 and 1990, after consulting with northerners, changes were made to ensure that this health program would best serve the northerners. In a private member's resolution on 31 May 1990, I introduced changes that were agreed upon by all members in the House. The changes called for the lowering of the travel distance requirement, removal of the age restriction for travel companions and coverage of accommodation expenses.

The people of northern Ontario are waiting for equal access to health care that has now been delayed by this government. Why will it not enact these changes immediately? I am calling on this government to stop making the people of northern Ontario wait for these services.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr Arnott: As recently as Thursday of last week, the Minister of Transportation affirmed his government's commitment to highway safety, making it one of his ministry's number one priorities.

In October 1989, former Wellington MPP Jack Johnson raised in this House the subject of safety on Highway 6 between Guelph and Owen Sound and called for an immediate study on the feasibility of constructing appropriate passing lanes on this hazardous, heavily travelled 130-kilometre stretch of highway.

In response, a study was undertaken by the ministry's regional office in London to determine the need for improvements to the highway in this area. The study's findings were to be released at the end of July of this year. To date, there has been no report.

Because of the tremendous support which all municipal councils in the area expressed for this initiative, I am extremely anxious to know whether or not the new Minister of Transportation has received a report on the Highway 6 study and, if so, how soon it will be available to the public and when the government will act on its recommendations.

SAULT STE MARIE

Mr Martin: I want to speak for a few minutes today about the place that I call home, the place I choose to raise four children. Sault Ste Marie is a beautiful city, situated in the very heart of Canada, approximately halfway between the two coasts. It boasts many natural resources, water and the forest being but two. Certainly the production of steel and paper has been the centre of economic activity for many years.

At this point in its history, Sault Ste Marie, like many Canadian communities its size, and because of its dependence on one major industry, Algoma Steel, is experiencing some difficult times. We are being challenged daily to rethink the way we do business and, living across the river from the United States, the reality of living in a global community and all that that entails.

However, the greatest asset of our city is our people. We have a wonderfully diverse, talented, energetic population, people who at moments become rather feisty with one another as we move forward into the next century; people who want to take advantage of those opportunities now present and to come to build a future which speaks of prosperity for all.

This brings me to the need to hold up to members one of our most outstanding citizens, a person many members may know because he served with them here in the House. Karl Morin-Strom represents for me the best Sault Ste Marie has to offer: a very highly educated, Harvard-trained economist, a PhD who chose to return to his community to work and returned to it some of what it gave him as a youth. Karl is a hardworking man of high principles and very well developed moral values. Karl, for me, represents the best in all of us from Sault Ste Marie: principled, caring and committed.

FIRE PREVENTION

The Speaker: Last Thursday 22 November, the honourable member for Carleton raised a point of order about the appropriateness of a statement made by the honourable member for Perth during members' state-

ments. I undertook at that time to review Hansard and report to the House. I have had an opportunity to do so and I must report that I could find nothing that went against our practices in the statement made by the honourable member for Perth, as she is not a parliamentary assistant.

I would like to take this opportunity, however, to remind honourable members that members' statements time is not to be used for parliamentary assistants to make statements that ought to be made during that period reserved for statements by the ministry, nor should it be an opportunity to make personal attacks on other members.

FOOD CONTAINERS

The Speaker: Also on Thursday last during question period, the honourable member for Nipissing, the leader of the third party, asked a question of the Minister of the Environment which dealt with the use of disposable containers. In his supplementary to the minister the subject matter expanded to the use of the containers in the Legislative Assembly cafeteria and, among other things, the windows in the Legislative Building.

During the minister's reply, I interrupted the minister because I felt that the supplementary question dealt with a matter which came under the jurisdiction of the Office of the Assembly and that therefore it should be dealt with by the Board of Internal Economy.

I have looked into this and wish to report to the House that I will be sending each member of the assembly a report on this matter in the very near future.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

TRANSIT SERVICES

Hon Mr Philip: By way of introducing this important statement, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of previous ministers of transportation who in various ways laid the groundwork for the initiatives that I will be announcing today.

Public transportation plays an important role in fostering a clean environment, a good quality of life and economic prosperity. But right now our urban transportation in southern Ontario is under pressure, strained by the past decade's dramatic population growth and economic expansion, and we are all aware of the consequences: pollution, energy waste, traffic congestion, commuter frustration, accidents and a very real threat to our economic competitiveness.

There is no single, simple solution. However, I am convinced that we can make a difference through better use of transit systems and transit corridors. Today I am announcing the first of a series of initiatives to encourage this, the greening of transportation in Ontario.

In Metropolitan Toronto we must ensure that the TTC remains the "better way." Riders of the system have come to expect excellent service, the best in North America, this despite the fact that in the 1980s fewer real dollars were invested in Toronto's transit system than in the

1950s. In order to maintain the TTC's service and reputation, my ministry will provide an additional \$70 million over five years specifically to improve subway maintenance and reliability. This funding, which will cover 75% of the cost of anticipated capital improvements, will directly benefit TTC riders.

1350

But money for maintenance is not the only answer. It is absolutely essential that workers' skills are developed to meet the challenges of the future. With that goal in mind, my ministry will undertake a review of the opportunities to expand and improve transit maintenance training. We will work with operators, unions and colleges to establish training centres which will promote expertise in transit maintenance for the domestic and international markets.

There has been rapid growth in population around our urban centres and there are now 17 individual transit systems within the greater Toronto area alone. Commuting patterns require that we eliminate artificial barriers. People must be able to travel easily from one public transit system to another. Therefore, my ministry will lead discussion with regional and local governments on finding new ways to link services so that transit use is encouraged.

We recognize that one of the most efficient and flexible means of moving people is by dedicated, exclusive lanes for the use of buses and car pools. For this new thrust, we intend to work with municipalities to encourage and define a network of high-occupancy-vehicle lanes in the major urban areas.

This government knows the importance of long-range planning and we are determined to leave our mark in this area. We must protect the corridors in the GTA for future transit systems. As a result, I am announcing that we will now include exclusive transit corridors in the planning of Highway 403 and Highway 407.

I am also announcing that the first phase of a co-operative federal-provincial study on ground transportation needs for Pearson International Airport and the surrounding area should be available for public discussion in the spring. I would like to compliment my federal counterpart, the Honourable Doug Lewis, on his willingness to work with the provincial government in this area.

In addition, we are discussing with CN, CP and the Department of Transport the potential for using existing rail freight corridors for commuter and passenger rail services. This review will include corridors which are currently being used for passenger rail purposes and those which are not. We will also purchase abandoned railway rights of way which are most appropriate for future transportation purposes. In this regard, my ministry has initiated discussions with CN towards the acquisition of the CN rail line north of Stouffville and through Uxbridge.

GO rail usage has grown dramatically, with ridership up 50% in the last three years. GO Transit will play an ever-increasing role in this government's environmentally sensitive transportation plans. We intend to develop a

long-term passenger rail transportation strategy towards the efficient movement of people in southern Ontario. We will also accelerate GO Transit rail service expansion as we move towards all-day, two-way service in the Milton, Georgetown, Richmond Hill, Stouffville, Hamilton and Oshawa GO rail lines. Where demand exists, nothing short of all-day service will suffice.

We are interested in co-operative ventures whenever possible. We have established with Via Rail the conditions under which Via will provide a commuter service between Brantford and Toronto.

I am happy to provide some additional information which was not known at the time that my statement was circulated to the press gallery and members of the opposition parties. Before I entered the House, I had just been informed by the office of the Honourable Doug Lewis that they have approved the service of London through Brantford to Toronto, and I can inform the residents of Brantford that that service will begin on 14 January of next year.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Philip: I am not sure the leader of the official opposition could take that much excitement, but I will continue none the less.

We will be initiating a government-subsidized bus-GO rail link to serve the diverse public transportation needs of the people living in Peterborough and Durham region. We will work with private bus carriers in consultation with municipalities to provide frequent reliable service. Schedule co-ordination and through ticketing will be available to ensure smooth transfers between bus and enhanced Oshawa and Whitby GO rail service.

This undertaking will not only serve the needs of the people travelling to the many destinations in Metropolitan Toronto, but will also carry workers to General Motors in Oshawa and other major destinations of public transit users in the region. Pending discussions with the private carriers, we expect the service will begin in February 1991.

I would like to confirm that this government will support the rapid transit infrastructure investments outlined in the Let's Move program. These include such projects as the Yonge-Spadina subway loop, the Sheppard subway, the Scarborough rapid transit expansion, the Eglinton West corridor and the Mississauga busway. We are now working with the Toronto Transit Commission and GO Transit to co-ordinate equipment orders for this major program. There are thousands of workers in Thunder Bay and Kingston who will be thrilled to hear this, not to mention the thousands of other workers across the province employed with transit industry suppliers.

The initiatives announced today to expand public transit services and increase usage reinforce this government's pledge to reduce vehicle emissions and lessen transportation's excessive dependency on non-renewable energy.

To ensure our success we will work closely with local and regional municipalities, transit operators, the railways, the private motor coach companies and others.

Together we will provide transportation which serves people effectively, keeps our cities livable and protects the environment for those who will follow us.

PENSION FUNDS

Hon Mr Rae: My government has instructed its lawyers to withdraw from a case scheduled to be heard in the Ontario Court of Appeal tomorrow 27 November 1990. The decision to withdraw is consistent with our long-standing belief that all money in pension plans is deferred wages of the pension plan members and ought to be used only to pay for benefits under the plan.

When the case is heard, employees of the Ontario Hospital Association will be challenging the propriety of contribution holidays in their pension plan. The employees are appealing a 1988 decision of the Divisional Court which granted the OHA the right to withhold approximately \$82 million in contributions to the employees' pension plan, the hospitals of Ontario pension plan.

The previous government supported the hospital association and not the employees at the Ontario Divisional Court in 1988 and had intended to support the OHA's contribution holiday at the Court of Appeal.

There are many important issues around our government's withdrawal from the pension dispute between the OHA and the hospital employees.

First, for many years as members of the opposition, New Democrats have vigorously argued that so-called surplus funds in pension plans are in reality deferred wages and thus belong to the members of the pension plan. If there are surplus funds, the surplus should be used to improve benefits for plan members. That remains our position as a government.

1400

Second, the pension legislation of the previous Liberal government is unclear on the issue of contribution holidays. For this reason, the hospital employees and the OHA have been forced to resolve their dispute through expensive and time-consuming court proceedings. This case is not unique. Last year, the Canadian Union of Public Employees fought and won a similar case against Ontario Hydro.

Finally, as stated in the throne speech, my government plans to introduce pension reform. We are reviewing pension legislation and upon completion of the review we will be announcing details of our reform initiative. I assure members we will provide clear direction on pension policy and resolve the questions around the ownership of so-called surplus.

My government will not force pension plan members and sponsors to wage expensive legal battles to establish pension policy in this province. We have long upheld the right of women and men to retire with dignity and with economic security, and our commitment to decent pensions for retired workers remains stronger than ever.

RESPONSES

PENSION FUNDS

Mr Chiarelli: I would like to respond to the Premier's statement. First, I want to say that he is doing a bit of grandstanding. He is taking the chicken way out. The New Democratic Party is on record in its Agenda for People to permit surpluses to go to the benefit of workers. They are on record for many years. They are also on record supporting indexation. What the Premier has done here is something that is so small and picayune on the main issue that he is trying to deflect from the people of this province, that he is backtracking once again on a major promise of this government.

He had every opportunity to introduce legislation to deal with surpluses. What does he do? He withdraws from a court case. The Ontario Hospital Association can proceed with the case and can be successful. What if they are successful? What happens to the surplus? Where is the Premier's legislation? Where is his commitment? This is another case of this government backtracking and not having the guts to honour its own commitments.

The people on the back benches over there know what their Agenda for People is. They know that they want the surplus to go to the workers. Where is the legislation? Why did the Premier not come out and support the workers in this case. He simply withdraws. The case probably will be made just as well by the OHA lawyers. If they are successful, what happens to the surplus?

The Premier does not have the courage of his convictions. He has refused to bring in substantial legislation to deal with his agenda and it is another broken commitment.

TRANSIT SERVICES

Mrs Sullivan: I would like to respond to the announcement from the Minister of Transportation. I noticed that the minister appears to have taken his speech from the desk drawer, since it really refers to a great deal of initiatives that had in fact been undertaken by the previous government.

The minister, I notice, has broken his GO rail promise relating to Peterborough, but generally we must welcome the announcement of the continuation of the Let's Move program. That \$5-billion commitment to rapid transit infrastructure made by the Liberal government is critical in moving people through the greater Toronto area and critical to our environment.

While the Toronto Transit Commission will clearly benefit from the \$70 million in new capital allocations, we are concerned that there is no announcement and no mention of additional operating commitments. When will the minister make clear to the people of Toronto that the commitment is a solid and continuing one and that the province of Ontario has a real stake in supporting the Toronto Transit Commission and the movement of people through rapid transit in this area?

I am surprised to see that the remainder of the minister's statement was really a reiteration of policies

and actions that had been initiated by the previous government. The integration of public transit systems was addressed in the first stages through the integration of fares of the TTC and GO, and through the gateway programs. The federal-provincial study on ground transportation needs for Pearson International Airport was under way through the last government.

The minister clearly believes in recycling, so much so that part of what he has announced is already under way. His colleagues must have listened carefully and with some disappointment, however, because the minister made no reference, for example, to the Via Rail cuts in northeastern Ontario. There is much that can be applauded here, but much has been left out.

Mr Sorbara: Just one word on the minister's announcement with respect to transportation and particularly on his commitment to actually undertake the construction of the looping of the two subway systems, the two lines, in Metropolitan Toronto. I hope he will be aware that there was a great deal of discussion both within his ministry and in the community to make sure that alignment passed to York University and along Steeles Avenue.

In the throne speech we saw nothing dealing with education and particularly higher education. One of the things the Minister of Transportation could do, if he had the daring, would be to confirm within the next few days that York University will be brought into the Metropolitan Toronto transit system by way of the TTC and that the new line that loops the two lines will pass along Steeles Avenue.

It has been a great burden on York University over the past 25 years of its history not to be integrated into the transportation system. The minister has an opportunity today or in the next few weeks to solve that problem once and for all.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party?

Mr Harris: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am sorry; I did not know whether all the leadership candidates had an opportunity to speak yet or not.

Interjections.

Mr Harris: I gather from the comments they all have not. I know what it is like. I have been through it not that long ago, and I understand exactly.

Interjections.

Mr Harris: Use every 30 seconds you can find.

PENSION FUNDS

Mr Harris: I tried to make some sense of the comments of the member for Ottawa West and I am really not sure what he was talking about on the statement of the Premier. However, I would like to make a few comments.

Number one, I want to agree with the Premier on page 2 of his announcement where he says his government "will not force pension plan members and sponsors to

wage expensive legal battles to establish pension policy in this province."

I agree with the Premier. It is a disgrace the way the situation has been left for far too long, not just by the former government over the past five years, but by all governments that have allowed this situation to deteriorate and the uncertainty to be there over this past decade.

The opportunities in the past five years to come forward have been numerous. In fact, we have slipped backwards from the progress that had been made in the early half of the decade, but admittedly not enough had been done. I agree with the Premier that the sooner we get on with this, the better it is, so everybody knows where he stands on these matters.

I have a question, though, on page 1. The Premier indicates clearly: "If there are surplus funds, the surplus should be used to improve benefits for plan members. That remains our position as a government." He states that was his position in opposition and that is his position in government. I understand that. I accept that position. It is a position I have talked about as well.

However, there is another side that must go with that position. I would ask him, since he is now in charge, if the surplus funds should be used to improve benefits for plan members, what happens when there is a shortfall? Is that shortfall then made up by plan members or is the shortfall then cause to reduce the benefit being paid to those pensioners?

I would suggest to him that is the question that has to be resolved. Everything that he has come forward with is an add-on, is an add-on, is an add-on. I appreciate that and appreciate the concern, but until he answers that question, it is not good enough to answer just one half of it.

Finally, since he indicates that there was some \$82 million that the former government had planned to use in capital for hospitals, aside from the pension argument, I was surprised that his statement made no mention of that \$82 million. Does the Premier plan to make up the \$82-million shortfall for capital for hospitals that had been announced by the previous government, recognizing that even that was not enough to keep up with capital construction required by hospitals in this province?

1410

TRANSIT SERVICES

Mr Arnott: On behalf of the third party, I wish to respond to the series of announcements by the Minister of Transportation this afternoon. I must say that I am pleased, generally, that the government has stated its intent to proceed with commitments made by the former government, the \$5-billion Let's Move program, although without a time line for the important transit initiatives it wishes to undertake, including the Sheppard subway, we are still left not knowing specifically when these initiatives will be undertaken.

I am pleased that these measures will be taken in this economic climate, when infrastructure investments provide

good value for the dollar. I am also pleased because the throne speech was significant in its lack of interest in transportation issues, with only a fleeting mention of infrastructure improvements, which were not well defined. I might add that had the GO Transit announcement to Peterborough been made earlier, the GO train service to Peterborough could have commenced on 1 January 1991 instead of February, and it is going to disappoint a lot of people in Peterborough.

I am disappointed that the much-vaunted promise to four-lane the Trans-Canada Highway has obviously been put on the back burner at this time.

In closing, I would like to say I was very pleased to hear the members on the government side breaking out in spontaneous applause to support the federal government and the Minister of Transport, the Honourable Doug Lewis.

ORAL QUESTIONS

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Premier. His views have been stated publicly that he does not believe the present constitutional arrangements and the Constitution of the nation are serving the province adequately. He has since said and referred in the throne speech to his hope that all members of the House can be involved in the development of Ontario's stance in this regard, and yet we have had nothing concrete to lead us in the matter even though other jurisdictions have established a variety of committees and agenda items that would allow the consideration to go forward there.

Can the Premier explain to the House and give us some clear indication of what his intention is so that the government and this House can be informed of the views of the people of Ontario and also the direction which Ontario should be taking in order to maintain its position of leadership in these constitutional discussions?

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the question from the Leader of the Opposition, and I will say that the reason there was nothing specific proposed in the throne speech was very simple: because I thought it would be better for me to discuss it with him and with the leader of the third party prior to announcing it to the House, and I genuinely regard this as a non-partisan question, as I think I have mentioned to the Leader of the Opposition in discussions I have had with him. I will be having these further discussions with him very shortly, as well as with the leader of the third party, and it will, I hope, allow us to have a discussion in this province and indeed in this Legislature which will serve the country well.

Let me also say briefly that it is not simply a question of the fact that the Constitution is not working for Ontario simply from an Ontario standpoint. It is the fact that I think many Canadians feel, as we said in the throne speech, that our federal institutions, and indeed all our institutions, can be made to work better.

I genuinely regard this not as a partisan exercise, so rather than make an ex cathedra announcement in the throne

speech I thought it would be wiser for us to engage in this in a genuinely non-partisan way. If he is impatient for our proposals, I can only tell him that they are going to be coming very soon indeed.

Mr Scott: I want to thank the Premier for his answer, but it seems to me it does not respond to one of the problems that we confront this week. There was considerable consternation in the House a couple of years ago when the federal New Democratic Party ran a candidate in the province of Quebec who was committed to sovereignty. That was heightened when in a recent by-election the same thing happened. As the Premier will know, last week Mr Edmonston, speaking for his federal leader, presented the New Democratic brief to the Bélanger-Campeau commission.

In that brief, he said that things were looking up because Ontario had a new Premier who was committed to decentralization of the federation. Then he went on to recommend, on behalf of the federal New Democratic Party, that Quebec should be granted sovereignty and the central government should have only the powers that were delegated to it by the province of Quebec.

I understand that the Premier has his plans for some kind of consultation with the House, and we are entirely supportive of those, but can the Premier tell us today—and I think Ontarians are entitled to know—what the government's position is with respect to the policy enunciated last week in Quebec City by the federal New Democratic Party?

Hon Mr Rae: I have had all kinds of views ascribed to me in the past on the subject of the Constitution and on many other matters. I can assure the members that Mr Edmonston was not speaking for me. I had no discussions with him. He does not represent my views, particularly, on this subject.

There are Liberals who are members of the Bélanger-Campeau commission; there are Conservatives who are members of the Bélanger-Campeau commission. I say to the member for St George-St David that it would be very regrettable if he were to try to turn this into some kind of partisan exercise, because that is not the approach we are taking and that is not the approach I am taking.

I say to him quite sincerely that if he wants to know where I stand on this question, I believe in a renewed federalism, I believe in a Canada which means something to Canadians from coast to coast, and I believe in the government of Ontario expressing as clearly as it can the views, not just of the New Democratic Party, not just of the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party, but indeed of all the citizens of the province who deserve, it seems to me, to have a chance to recognize that this is not a partisan question.

There will be people appearing before the Bélanger-Campeau commission who will be putting forward a whole range of views. That is not the agenda of the Legislature of Ontario, it is not the agenda of the government of Ontario, and I do not believe it is the agenda of the people of Ontario. I am sure the former Attorney General, who served the province well in his capacity in constitutional discussions, would not want to see this turn into some kind of partisan discussion.

Mr Scott: I remind the Premier that we are exercising precisely the role he saw fit to exercise almost daily when he asked the Premier of the day his position on constitutional matters as we went through the Meech Lake exercise. The difference is that the Premier of the day answered in the Legislature and answered to the people.

The question I am asking is not what the Premier has to say about Mr Edmonston's opinion of him. I am asking the Premier if he supports the policy of his own federal party which was expressed to favour a sovereign Quebec with central powers only as delegated.

It is not partisan, and I reject the assertion, to ask the provincial leader of the NDP whether he supports what Mrs McLaughlin and her party have submitted in Quebec City. I think the people of Ontario, without being partisan, are entitled to know the answer to that question.

Hon Mr Rae: I do not know how I can be clearer. Perhaps I will try again. I made it as clear as I possibly could.

Mr Scott: Well, I did not understand.

Hon Mr Rae: Then I will try to make it clear again. To be perfectly honest with the member for St George-St David, I do not know whether what Mr Edmonston has said is a total reflection of all his views. I do not know that. I can only say to the member that the views which he has described, where the powers of the federal government would be only those delegated by a series of sovereign provinces, is not my view of either the current Constitution or a realistic view of what a good Constitution for the country would be. I think the former Attorney General, in his heart of hearts, knows that; I think he knows that perfectly well.

As I say to the member, I look forward to a number of discussions about Canada in this House, but I also want to say one other thing to him. I believe the preoccupation of the people of Ontario is ensuring, first of all, that we have an economy that is working and that will help us to get out of recession. That is the first priority of the people of this province.

The constitutional approach we take, the discussions which we will have as a Legislature, should reflect that priority, our concern that Canada must be made to work better, that our institutions must be made to work better. We will do it best if we approach it not as simply expressing a narrow regional view or a sectoral view or a partisan view, but if we approach it in this moment as an issue that should unite Canadians, that should unite all the members of this Legislature, as we tried to do, if I may say, when we were in opposition. We will certainly try to apply that same spirit when we are the government of the province.

1420

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Mr Nixon: I appreciate the Premier's comments about the preoccupation of the people of the province with the economy. I recall very clearly that the Premier, since taking office, has contacted his colleague first mini-

sters and the Prime Minister of Canada with the thought that a first ministers' conference on the economy might very well be held. I think all members of this House would agree that many policies of the federal government are detrimental to the strengthening of our economy and that the bad impact of high interest rates and the federal deficit probably is focused here more than anywhere else.

Will the Premier report to the House on the success of his efforts through the other premiers to convene such a conference, which could co-ordinate provincial approaches to national policy on the economy?

Hon Mr Rae: I would be glad to. Let me give the Leader of the Opposition a little bit of background.

When the former Premier met with his colleagues in Winnipeg in August during the election campaign, it is my understanding that one of the things they tentatively agreed to was that they would try to arrange a meeting at the end of November in Calgary. I was not aware of that agreement, but I was made aware of it after the election of 6 September when I received a letter from the Premier of Alberta, Mr Getty. The Premier wrote me a very friendly letter, congratulating and welcoming me as a new Premier, and said he wanted to know how I felt about the idea of there being such a meeting of first ministers. I phoned him up right away and said I thought that would be a very good idea. I was then asked about it by a number of reporters and said I thought it was a good idea. I have spoken about it with some other premiers. As recently as a few days ago, when he was here, Mr Filmon and I agreed it would be a good idea.

I continue to believe that a national conference on the economy of all the first ministers, including the Premier of Quebec and the Prime Minister, would be a very good idea. I continue to express that view. I can only tell members that I suspect the momentum for this will grow, particularly if the member keeps on asking these questions.

Mr Nixon: May I say that I believe such a conference would be worth while. The fact that the Prime Minister does not want to participate probably means he does not want another group of people, including a number of Progressive Conservative premiers, to be criticizing the monetary policy of the government of Canada, as it has had such dramatic and bad effects on the economy of the nation, but particularly here in Ontario.

I think a person might also understand why the Premier's new-found friend, Premier Filmon, would support him in this. The Premier of Alberta does not seem to be as enthused as he was.

Is the Premier thinking perhaps of going it alone and conducting some sort of conference here in Toronto to which representatives, at least, if not the first ministers of the other provinces, might be invited so that we can focus the problems which we feel here probably more than in any other province, and that these can be used perhaps to adjust the policy of the government of Canada, which has been so detrimental to our economy?

Hon Mr Rae: I do not want to hold just a media event. I want to do something that is going to be effective.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that I have done everything I can to express the view as clearly as I can that the interest rate policy of the federal government is devastating to our economy, as it is to many other economies across the country, that the dollar is too high and that this is affecting our ability to export to the United States and elsewhere, and that we need to have a change in federal policies, particularly in these two areas but not only. That is why I have said I think it is essential that the first ministers get together.

The suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition makes is, I think, an interesting one. It is not something I am rejecting out of hand, and if he has any other suggestions he can make as to how we can get the federal government to change its position and its policies, if he wants to convey these to me privately or publicly in any way, I am listening, because I believe the policies of the federal government are wrong. I think they are bad for Canada, not just for Ontario. They are the wrong policies for Canada at this time. Anything we can do together as a Legislature in order to get the federal government to recognize how destructive these policies are would be a positive contribution. If he wants to help us in that regard, I accept his help 100%.

Mr Nixon: It will probably take the electorate to change the policies of the government of Canada, but that will probably happen, as its support rating has now dropped below the interest rates that are part of that monetary policy.

I do have another suggestion. It seems to me, as I recall in the mists of the past, that the treasurers meet in December. Quite often, these meetings are held in Toronto, as the treasurers gather together with their retinue of minions to do a little Christmas shopping. The treasurers themselves, of course, have their noses to the grindstone, their shoulders to the wheel and their ears to the ground—which actually only this Treasurer could do without inconvenience.

I believe, failing the conference the Premier was moving towards earlier in his ministry, that there is an opportunity when the treasurers meet for some very frank exchange of views. I do not know whether such a conference is planned—and it may very well be in Toronto—but it could be an appropriate time for the Treasurer or the Premier or others to have a chance to get the views of the House before they express them to the other ministers of finance. I think we are the only people left with a Treasurer.

On that occasion, the federal government is represented by Michael Wilson. Certainly that is a good way to express directly the views to the government of Canada. Perhaps the Premier could indicate what special efforts would be made to see that we can focus and concentrate our concerns here in Ontario in these economic matters.

Hon Mr Rae: I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that the finance ministers are going to be meeting in Winnipeg, not in Toronto, on 5 and 6 December. It is not a federal-provincial meeting, but it is a meeting of provin-

cial ministers of finance to which the Treasurer will be going.

The Treasurer is shaking his head—the Leader of the Opposition—I will get it right. The Leader of the Opposition is shaking his head and saying it is strange that the federal Minister of Finance is not there. I can only say to him that this is what is happening. It is happening in Winnipeg. We are going to have a debate on Thursday on the economic situation in the province. I think that will be an opportunity for the House to focus its mind and its attention on this question before the Treasurer leaves for Winnipeg and speaks on behalf of the province.

I say it is crucial for us to work together in this matter. I repeat, interest rates are too high; they are very destructive of the real economy. The dollar is too high, very destructive of our economy right now. This is a view shared by business people, by small businesses, by larger manufacturers; there is not a business person I talk to in this province, large or small, who does not share the views I have just expressed. How we can get Ottawa to wake up and smell the coffee is a challenge for all of us and something we should all unite in doing in this Legislature.

Mr Harris: I understand why the Premier mixes up the Treasurer. They are both big-spending treasurers who really do not care about the taxpayers' money and I see little difference in either one of them.

An hon member: He didn't invite you to the Dome.

Mr Harris: I thought the member would be embarrassed to go to the SkyDome, or I would invite him to go there.

1430

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Minister of Government Services. Last week the minister, contrary to previous statements that were made by the Premier, assured the House that this government would honour the commitments made by the former government to relocate some 5,000 civil service jobs outside of Metropolitan Toronto. As a former negotiator for the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, I am sure the minister was well aware of the impact this could have had on many employees who are unwilling or unable, for a variety of reasons, to relocate.

However, following the throne speech it was reported that the minister told a union delegation that the government would guarantee job security before any relocation takes place. I wonder if the minister could share with the House, as she did with the OPSEU members, what specific guarantees for job security have been promised to OPSEU members.

Hon Ms Lankin: In fact I did share that with the House last week in response to a question from the member for St Catharines-Brock, and the answer is that we have put in place or are putting in place over the next four months a human resources package that will include as a

cornerstone of it a job offer guarantee—not a complete job offer or job security in that sense. That is the same program that was in place with respect to the northern Ontario relocation program.

I would say that we are attempting to put in place more of a program with respect to training and retraining, but the plans for that are being developed in conjunction with senior management and with some discussions with the bargaining unit over the next four months and I hope to be able to report to my cabinet colleagues in March what the actual package will look like.

Mr Harris: We are told by the secret report of the Premier's Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet which surfaced last week, "It may be difficult for the civil service to absorb all of those who wish to stay in Toronto." The former Liberal government, in relocating the ministries of Northern Development and Correctional Services, was able to provide suitable job offers because at the same time as it was relocating 2,000 civil servants it was busy hiring 8,000 new ones. So it really was not difficult to maintain the job offers and, in fact, if 2,000 went outside of Toronto, presumably Toronto got 6,000 new ones anyway, occupying all this new space. So they did not have a problem.

I would ask the minister if in fact she too intends to increase the size of our now inflated civil service and how much this is expected to add to the projected billion-dollar cost of the relocation program, as best I understand that cost to date.

Hon Ms Lankin: The plans for a human resources package do not include any plans to increase the size of the civil service to take care of that. We are concerned, in fact, that the Toronto area will not be able to absorb all of the surplus employees if we move ahead in an unplanned fashion.

One of the things we will be doing is attempting to phase the job relocations by moving some people, in advance of the actual date of completion of the building, into temporary locations in the cities. That might help phase the process of being able to replace and determine who is surplus and find them other locations and jobs over a longer period of time.

I am not sure what the member speaks to when he talks about 6,000 new jobs. It may be that there were a number of jobs that were converted in the past number of years from unclassified to classified, which may have changed the numbers as well. I am not sure if there were new jobs created. That is not part of the strategy. However, I would tell him that we are facing a series of litigation cases of who is the employer—that is left over as a result of inaction and inattention of the previous government—which may, without any proactive, I guess, activities on our part, increase the size of the civil service in a way that we are not able to control. But I am hopeful, looking at that and trying to get an understanding of what that may mean in terms of an impact to the size of the civil service.

Mr Harris: I believe we have heard enough conflicting information about relocation. The Liberal plan was not a relocation plan. Of the 8,000 new civil servants, 2,000 would go to communities outside of Toronto, for which we are very grateful and which we think was a good decision. However, that is assuming you are going to add 8,000 new civil servants. So what we have in the minister's situation is that she has now committed to carry on this plan with over 5,000 civil servants. If the same statistics are true, some 3,500 of those civil servants will not relocate out of Toronto, and the minister has guaranteed them a job.

I would like to know if she has factored in the cost of accommodating here in Toronto those 3,500 or so civil servants who will not and do not wish to, or cannot, move. How much saving is there actually going to be if the minister is going to provide jobs for these people? Presumably they are going to have an office in Toronto to stay in through that. Since the minister has made the decision to proceed with the Liberal plan unequivocally, I gather—that decision, as I understood it, last week—could the minister table with us all of the cost-benefit analysis information that she has, or is she going to keep it secret and hidden the way the Liberals did throughout all that period of time?

Hon Ms Lankin: I think the member has misunderstood or is making a mistake in his statements. I have not said that there is a job guarantee; I have said that, similar to the NOR program, there is a job offer guarantee. I hope that we will be able to absorb all of the people, but given the numbers involved here, we may have problems doing that. We are going to put a plan in place to phase in an attempt, to the best of our ability, to absorb those people with jobs that come open and jobs that are available. There is a very big difference between a job guarantee and a job offer guarantee.

On the second part of the question, with respect to tabling information with respect to costs, I can table estimates with respect to the capital costs. We are not sure until we review that program. I am hopeful of trying to scale that down. At this point in time with respect to the human resource costs, I can say, in a global sense, there is a guess that it could cost around \$150 million for relocation costs, retraining costs and others. Once we have some plans more definitely put together and we have a sense of that, and of how many people may or may not be relocating, I would be glad to share that information with the members opposite.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr Cousens: In view of the absence of the Minister of the Environment, I will call upon the Premier to respond, if he will, please. Last week the Minister of the Environment stated that her plans for a long-term landfill site would avoid the need for interim sites in the greater Toronto area. The Premier has to know that indeed all the existing landfill sites will be full by 1993; and even if he exceeds his 25% reduction strategy of the next few years, there will still be two million to three million tonnes of

garbage to dispose of annually. So the waste reduction strategy must begin immediately.

Is the Premier prepared to table the government's plan today for waste reduction in landfill sites so that we in this House can share his government's confidence that he will not have to use emergency powers and bypass public hearings?

Hon Mr Rae: In the absence of the minister, who I am sure the member knows is unavoidably away today, and indeed for a good deal of this week, I want to say to him that I am not in a position to table that information for him today but that we will be in a position to do that in the near future.

I also want to say to him that there are two keys to what we are doing. The first is that we have to mobilize the people of this province in a recognition that reducing and reusing and recycling waste are the foundations of a policy; that this has not been done up until now and it has to start. That is the key to what we are proposing with respect to the interim sites.

The second thing that the member did not mention, and that I want to mention to him, is that we are also attempting to speed up and to give greater focus and attention to the determination of the so-called long-term site; that this again is something that we cannot have done on the never-never. That is something where we have to focus. So the work that the minister is proposing on the environmental assessment review and the work that we are proposing with respect to giving the authority some clear legal power in the ability to do its job are equally important to the strategy of reduction.

I can assure the member that the reduction strategy is intended to work and that it will work if it has the support and the understanding of the members of this Legislature and the people of the province, and that is exactly what we intend to do.

1440

Mr Cousens: There is not anyone in this House who does not believe and accept the need for the 3Rs, and I know that we will all do our best on that. But it goes to the deeper question, which is the long-term solution that the Premier is talking about, and that is how the Environmental Assessment Act would be amended to speed up the whole environmental assessment process.

What we have to look at is, if this discussion paper on what the Premier is going to do to handle the long-term resolution is released immediately and amendments to the Environmental Assessment Act are finally passed in June of next year, which would be fairly good timing the way this place moves, the process then has at least six months before it gets under way. Then we have to find a site, and if it is as large a site as I think it is going to be and as the minister has indicated it is going to be, we are going to be talking about a full EA. At that point he might well have a judicial review, and he will still have time for engineering and construction of the site. This could take up to five years.

How does the Premier feel it would be possible to avoid using his emergency powers to open the Whitevale

and Brampton sites and to expand existing sites, all of which will be done without the full benefit of an environmental assessment?

Hon Mr Rae: I say to the member that this is one of the major priorities for our government. I think it has to be one of the major focuses of the Legislature, and it will be, as I have said to the member. All I can say is that the key to this succeeding is that we get on with the 3Rs, that the 3Rs be the focus with respect to the initial problem and that we also get on with speeding up the process of finding a long-term site. That is precisely why we are taking the steps we have.

The member says there is no opposition to the 3Rs. All I can say is that there has been a lot of talk about the 3Rs, but there has not been the kind of leadership and detailed action that is required. I also say to him that we are working on this as quickly as we can as a government. We will have proposals not just for the House; we will have proposals for the people of this province. Essentially, it is in the people's hands as to whether this 3Rs solution can be made to work. We will be prepared to exercise that leadership, but that is the reality—all of us have to be involved in finding that solution.

Mrs Marland: I suggest that is the most accurate statement our new Premier has made, when he says it is in the people's hands. That is exactly where the garbage will be before we get much longer into this history.

I suggest to the Premier that when we talk about the 3Rs, that is a very realistic and also idealistic solution and it is one that we all support. That is not the question here. The question here is what is going to happen in the meantime. That is the concern of the people of this province and certainly the people in the greater Toronto area.

We do not need another environmental assessment review. That was already done under the environmental assessment program involvement project, which the Liberal government shelved. We have all that information on hand.

Last week the Premier's minister said she believes that she will not have to use her emergency powers to open the Whitevale and Brampton sites, but I suggest that sounds like Alice in Wonderland, because this Premier may not be aware that when the minister attempts to invoke her emergency powers to expand the Britannia Road and Keele Valley landfills, her government will be opening the door to lawsuits from both the city of Mississauga and the town of Vaughan. Certainly if we get into lawsuits, I suggest we will be into a very extended time frame.

During the election—and this is my question—this Premier went to Whitevale and said, "The people of Whitevale have every right to protection under a formal assessment." I ask the Premier today how he can justify those remarks in light of the admission of the Minister of the Environment last week when she said she is prepared to open those sites without an environmental assessment.

Hon Mr Rae: It is precisely because this government is convinced that there is a better solution that we are

putting as much emphasis as we possibly can as a government on reducing, reusing and recycling. It is precisely because of what was said during the election and what was said before.

The member talks about the possibilities of litigation. The possibilities of litigation, in terms of what various groups might or might not do, is a reality that all of us in government have to contend with, and that is why there is so much importance in our proceeding. It is a process that will parallel—it does not have to wait for—the passage of any amendments to the Environmental Assessment Act. The authority can be up and looking and doing the kind of preparatory discussion with respect to a long-term site as quickly as is humanly possible, and that is exactly what we have been trying to do and what we are trying to do as a government.

The second thing that needs to happen is that all of us have to recognize that the 3Rs have not really been tried. A lot of the rhetoric that has been put forward, a lot of the things that have been said have been said in the absence, frankly, of any clear policies with respect to the 3Rs of reducing, reusing and recycling. That is the commitment of our government. That is a commitment that has to mobilize all the people of the province in finding a solution, and we believe that together we can find that solution. We believe we can find that solution.

The Speaker: Before we continue with question period, I offer an observation, not meant to be critical at all, but simply an observation of the clock, that the leaders' questions and responses in total have occupied 35 of the 60 minutes available.

Mr Mancini: Very, very long answers given by the other side, Mr Speaker.

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr Mancini: My question is to the Minister of Transportation. The minister made an important policy announcement last week, stating that he would not go ahead with the previous government's plan to allow 53-foot trailers to operate in Ontario. First, I would like to express my disappointment that the minister avoided the Legislature in making this important public policy announcement. I would like to ask the minister about his method of making important public policy announcements.

As the minister will be aware, he caught the trucking industry by surprise with his announcement on 22 November. Given that the minister failed to consult with the Legislature, with industry trade associations or with individual companies, could the minister tell the House how he made this particular decision? Whose advice did he take?

Hon Mr Philip: My predecessor announced the lengthening of the truck and trailer lengths at the Ontario trucking convention, not in this House. If my honourable critic then is critical of me for making an announcement, in fact the announcement that was made was simply an announcement of the position that they expected, because

it was the position that our party had taken in opposition. We voted against the bill that was introduced by the previous Liberal government and the previous Liberal government considered that legislation so important that it did not bring it forward; instead, it called an election.

Mr Mancini: We are anxious to find out whom the minister consulted and whose advice he took before he made this announcement. In recent public interviews the minister stated that he made his decision based on the following observation: "I am not saying that the public perception is correct; I am simply saying that there is a perception" that these longer trailers are not as safe.

Given that an impartial study by the Roads and Transportation Association of Canada recommended in 1987 that Ontario bring in 53-foot trailers for safety, environmental and economic reasons, and given that numerous experts have agreed with this advice, I would like to ask the minister, does he believe that these important decisions should be based on perceptions that he acknowledges are incorrect, these decisions which will further damage the industry, or is he going to make decisions based on fact, impartiality and backed up with scientific advice and evidence?

1450

Hon Mr Philip: What has damaged the industry is not the 53-foot trailer; it is the deregulation instituted by the previous Liberal government. That is what has damaged the industry. What has damaged the industry is the fact that the previous government did not negotiate any kind of reciprocal agreements with the states of Michigan or New York so that we could get access to their markets instead of simply having them with access to our markets. That is what has damaged the industry, along with the free trade policies of the federal government and the high interest rate policies of the federal government. That is what is damaging the industry.

I can tell members that this government is undertaking a very broad-ranging safety study that will involve broad consultation with the industry and with all of the vested interests and that based on that safety study we will be making statements in this House as to a wide variety of safety measures, but at this point in time the public and others are not prepared to have the Liberal legislation for larger trucks go ahead.

Mr Arnott: My question is also to the Minister of Transportation. On Thursday of last week, the Minister of Transportation announced to the Ontario Trucking Association's annual convention that he would not be introducing new legislation which would allow longer trucks on Ontario highways. Because of the cancellation of orders for 48-foot trailers after the previous government's announcement on its intention to legislate the use of longer trucks and responding to pressure from trailer manufacturers who threatened to lay off workers, the former Liberal government issued 2,000 special permits to allow the use of the new 53-foot semitrailers that meet RTAC standards. I understand now that all 2,000 permits have been issued.

Now that the minister has announced he will not proceed with legislation, it is my understanding that many manufacturers and operators have been caught with undelivered trailer orders. Will the minister inform this House if he intends to issue additional special permits to take care of these operators and manufacturers and the number of permits he will issue?

Hon Mr Philip: The condition that the industry is now in is caused largely by the economic factors of the federal government and the high interest rates. That is what is causing the problem with the industry at the present time.

I can tell the member that the Liberal government did introduce, by administrative procedure, the issuance of 2,000 permits for the 53-foot trailers within the existing overall limitations, but that in no way lengthened the actual 23-metre lengths of the truck, pending the legislation, which the Conservatives voted for and the Liberals introduced. It is not my intention to reintroduce the Liberal administration for longer trucks in this province.

Mr Arnott: In his statement to the press on Thursday, the minister made a surprising and disturbing announcement indicating that his decision not to move ahead on the longer-truck legislation was based on the public's perception that these trucks were unsafe. Can the minister inform the House of how this perception was derived? Will he tell the House what specific empirical studies or polls have been undertaken to justify or support this perception? Is it this government's intention to govern by perception rather than by a rational assessment of the facts?

Hon Mr Philip: We have done a number of tests recently that indicate, and I shared this with the Ontario Trucking Association, there are major problems in terms of not only the perception but the reality of trucking, particularly with regard to unsafe brakes on trucks. We shared that with the trucking association. We indicated that we were going to take a number of initiatives with them to correct that problem. It is all part of a total safety package, and we in this House are committed to safety. I wish the honourable member shared my same concern for the safety issues.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

[Applause]

Mr B. Ward: I think they are clapping because I remembered to stand up.

My question is to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues. It is dealing with a very important topic for this month, and that is wife assault prevention. I think this House is aware that some of us have been wearing little tags from time to time. My question is, what are the initiatives being taken by the Ontario women's directorate which concern Wife Assault Prevention Month and, furthermore, what is the minister herself doing in relation to this month?

Hon Ms Swarbrick: I am particularly pleased to be able to answer this question for two reasons. First, it gives both the member for Brantford and myself our first opportunity to get used to speaking in this House. Second, it gives us, as a House, the opportunity to participate in our own way in the wife assault prevention campaign this month.

I know and recognize that the member who is responsible as the critic for women's issues and labour in the third party did spend time the other day in her member's statement on this important area, and I really thank her for that. I think it is really important that we all find the ways to play our parts.

I think that is especially important because there are still an awful lot of people out in our communities who remember that it has been only eight years since the majority of MPs laughed when this subject was raised in the House of Commons. I think it is especially important that we, as parliamentarians, show to our communities how importantly we treat this subject and how much we view wife assault as a crime and as a crime for which there is no excuse.

Some members, the honourable member for York North included, are aware of the fact that I have been a member of the board of directors of Yellow Brick House, a shelter for battered women. A few members also know I have had friends and neighbours who in fact have been battered spouses. So I am especially pleased to be able to take this on as one of my new responsibilities as the Minister without Portfolio for women's issues.

I know that some members, especially members of the opposition, are aware of some of the details of the campaign and the government initiatives against wife assault. I do not think, though, that we all are. So I would like to take a moment to take us through a few aspects—

Mr Runciman: Wait for the supplementary.

Hon Ms Swarbrick: That is what was directly asked to me of what this government does.

The Speaker: Perhaps the minister would consider making a statement on another occasion, giving us a brief response now and perhaps following it up later with some more detailed information during ministers' statements.

Hon Ms Swarbrick: I would like to give credit to the past government for some of the things it has done in this initiative. It did initiate a five-year initiative, and I will be brief in some of its activities. This is the fifth year of that initiative. That initiative gives my ministry, the Ontario women's directorate, the opportunity to co-ordinate the activities through 16 ministries to try to initiate prevention education, support services to victims and the enforcement that is needed to truly show that this is a crime that we must rid ourselves of as a society.

1500

Mr B. Ward: Could the minister briefly explain what this government plans on doing that is different from past governments?

Hon Ms Swarbrick: There are two things this government is already doing that are very different from what any past government has been game to do. The first thing is, we recognize that this is not a temporary problem that is going to be eradicated by temporary initiatives, and so we have made an ongoing commitment to make long-term planning arrangements to get rid of this problem.

The second thing is that this is the first government, to my knowledge, that has been willing to recognize that violence against women is rooted in the power imbalance between men and women in our society. I have heard no other government talk openly about that nor take the kind of steps that this government is already taking to redress that power imbalance, such as appointing strong, feminist women as 42.3% of the cabinet of the government of Ontario; such as appointing women to be 50% of the members of the most powerful committees of cabinet; such as appointing women to positions such as—

Interjections.

Hon Ms Swarbrick: I think that is crucial to the changes that are needed in our society.

The Speaker: I think that all the members are fully aware that we have in total, out of 130 of us, 70 who are new, and we are attempting to grapple with the procedure of asking questions and giving answers in a relatively short period of time. I trust that the members will learn quite quickly what is acceptable and what is not. Your patience has been tried somewhat. The Speaker will add one minute to the clock.

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr Kwinter: I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, and before I place it I want to congratulate him on his election and on his appointment to the cabinet as the minister. The New Democratic Party and its leader, Bob Rae, have been very critical of the previous government on the issue of opposing free trade. During the election campaign, the Premier promised that he would not implement any of the provisions of the free trade agreement under provincial control. I quote from the Premier on 23 August:

“We would not feel in any way, shape or form bound by the agreement. We would take our decisions as to what we would do and how we would intervene and on whose behalf we would intervene without regard to the free trade agreement.”

Now that the NDP has formed the government, and since there was no mention at all of free trade in the throne speech other than a passing, one-time reference to it, could the minister tell the House if his government is still committed to the statements that the Premier has made?

Hon Mr Pilkey: In response, the simple answer to that question is yes; and that goes for all statements that the Premier of this province makes.

I want to indicate as well that this government, since having taken office in this very difficult recessionary period, has used its very best efforts through the Ontario

Development Corp and other resources to assist those Ontario industries and companies which are in need and which we believe have an opportunity to be successful and to go on in this province to be gainful employers well after this recession is over.

It is our policy as well to try to assist those workers who have not been adequately looked after through the federal government in their commitments to looking after workers who had been displaced or affected. Those initiatives have not been taking place by the federal government, and through programs earlier announced by this government we will attempt to do that for the Ontario workforce wherever possible.

If there is a supplementary I will attempt to answer it, but that is a brief response.

Mr Kwinter: I am delighted that the minister seems to be so positive that he would in fact implement the Premier's statements. I even detected that the Premier was quite pleased and was nodding that yes, they would implement them.

Could the minister explain why we are in the present situation? We as a previous government had authorized the issuing of 2,000 permits for operation of 53-foot trailers pending the proclamation of Bill 96, and these permits were directed to Ontario operators and manufacturers. Immediately thereafter, the United States launched a complaint; their complaint was that we had in fact breached the free trade agreement, that under the agreement that could not be done. As a result, we in fact did have to issue permits to American companies.

I am sure the minister will know that when the 2,000 permits were made available, 1,400 of them were in fact picked up by Ontario manufacturing companies which provided jobs, as he said they want to do; it provided manufacturing, as he said they wanted to do, but within the last two weeks, close to 700 of those permits—the last 700—were picked up by Americans.

Now, those permits were picked up by Americans, which meant that Canadian manufacturers could not produce them, it meant that labourers working for Fruehauf could not build them and it also meant that the NDP government has again reneged on a promise that the minister has reaffirmed today. Could he tell me why this has happened and what he proposes to do about it?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I appreciate the opportunity from the former minister. The information supplied to me is that 69% have in fact been picked up by Canadian carriers.

ONTARIO SCIENCE CENTRE

Mrs Marland: My question is to the Minister of Culture and Communications, and I take this opportunity to welcome him and congratulate him on his appointment.

As the minister is well aware, there is currently a great deal of controversy about the events at the Ontario Science Centre, and it seems that under the previous Liberal government, Science Centre management signed a contract with Oman which discriminated against Israeli suppliers. Later, after receiving the advice of government

lawyers, the contract was amended to include the North American contract and had that clause added.

Last Monday, the minister fired the director of the Science Centre who signed the contract—fair enough, apparently. However, given the comments of the Premier outside this House last Wednesday when he said, “It isn’t over yet,” my question to the minister is, what is not over yet? What are the government lawyers looking at and why, and can we expect more firings?

Hon Mr Marchese: I do want to say that in relation to the whole Science Centre matter, an action has been taken against this ministry, so I cannot comment at all about specifics on that, but my ministry is not carrying out this investigation at this moment; the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations is doing that. That is something that is happening and is still going on, but in relation to the specifics, I cannot comment on that.

Mrs Marland: Perhaps the minister is misunderstanding my question. I am not asking questions at all to do with the dismissal decision that has been made by his ministry in light of the director’s position. In fact, it was reported that the minister had requested all the legal correspondence on this matter, and the Premier said there is an investigation ongoing and the board of directors has also launched an investigation.

What I would like to know, in the new spirit of openness which the Premier keeps promising us, to keep the members of this House and this province informed of all the ongoing investigations, is whether the minister would table in this House the original contract and the legal correspondence surrounding it and empower a committee of this Legislature to examine this issue. Would the minister agree to do those three things?

1510

Hon Mr Marchese: Again, I do believe I have understood the question well. Because an action has been taken against this ministry, there are things that we cannot bring to the attention of this House or of this member because obviously, since it is a legal matter, it would be a problem to bring such discussions to her.

In relation to other matters that are going on, I did point out that there is another minister who is carrying on other investigatory matters in relation to that, and the minister will be doing that. In relation to whether or not I can table anything else connected to this, from my understanding it would be very difficult to bring this matter to the attention of this House at this time because of the legal action. That is all I can add. If the Premier has anything to add, he might want to do that.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Chiarelli: My question is to the Minister of Financial Institutions. In April 1987, the minister’s Premier and his adviser, Mel Swart, said: “People want no more of the massive insurance rate increases. The solution is a driver-owned system of car insurance, and the time to set it up is now.” On 30 October, the minister promised in a prepared speech—and this was after he was

appointed minister—“a public, driver-owned, non-profit insurance system with access to courtrooms for injured victims.”

The NDP has put forward a very clear blueprint for a state-run auto insurance scheme. Will the minister explain why he now delays in producing legislation? He promised a plan. Can we see it now?

Hon Mr Kormos: You see, Mr Speaker, I was anticipating the question.

The Speaker: And you have a brief response.

Hon Mr Kormos: Being able to read minds is an onerous responsibility. Legislation, as was promised in the throne speech, is expected to be tabled in this assembly come spring of next year. In the meantime, we are talking with as many people as want to talk to us, including long and lengthy lists of representatives from the insurance industry. We are as interested in what they have got to say as we are in what the victims have to say, the victims of the Liberals’ so-called no-fault scheme. We are going to keep listening and, as I say, table the legislation come the appropriate time as promised in the throne speech.

The Speaker: Time has expired.

Mr Chiarelli: I thought we had agreed to—

The Speaker: No, I added a minute to the clock earlier. The time for oral questions has expired. I know you are disappointed.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, pursuant to standing order 33(a), I wish to advise you of my dissatisfaction with the response of the Minister of Transportation to my question on safety, environmental and economic reasons for longer trailers on Ontario highways, and the reason for my dissatisfaction is that the minister failed to answer my question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address and reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr Harris: I am pleased to rise today to participate in the debate on the speech from the throne. For those who are concerned about timing, I have let the pages know that I need a couple of glasses of water anyway. It is about a two-glasses-of-water comment today.

I know that all members were impressed, as I was, with the dignity and the authority which His Honour’s presence brought to the chamber last Tuesday and the remarks that were prepared for him by our first NDP government. I mention this because there is a tendency, even in this Legislature—he said somewhat tongue in cheek—to take lightly the historic traditions of our

democratic Parliament, traditions which are upheld by the various rituals and ceremonies that we undertake in this chamber.

Our parliamentary institutions have evolved since Confederation in a manner really unique to Canada. They are continuing to undergo change and discussions of further change as Canadians seek to achieve a broader degree of participation in the political process.

I draw attention to His Honour at the opening of my remarks because I believe that at this point in the evolution of our economic and our political institutions it is important for all of us here in this province to remember our national political heritage.

It is important that we build on the lessons that were taught to us by our political history, such as how our constitutional monarchy evolved out of absolutism to a free democracy and how the ownership of political power by a privileged few gave way to a government by the majority, freely elected by free men and free women, all equal under law.

We must be mindful of how we evolved from a class society with inherited rights and inherited wealth into an economy in which hard work, initiative and enterprise were rewarded, and how this helped our society to evolve from gross economic disparity between the very rich and the very poor to a society which is a long way from perfect, I think we would all argue, but which has achieved a remarkable balance between the right to create and preserve personal opportunities and our obligation to share these opportunities fairly.

Above all, we have a rule of law that is continuing to reach out to remove the barriers of inequality, to eliminate prejudice, to guarantee the inalienable rights of Canadians to enjoy freedom of association and expression and individual liberty. This is what we have inherited from those who have preceded us in this Legislature and our successive parliaments of Canada.

I see the former Treasurer has come back to the chamber. I could talk about some of the other things we have inherited as well and no doubt, during the course of these remarks, I will. However, the traditions we have inherited and the changes we have made—I think it is important that we do reflect on those and that we do appreciate those. Our parliamentary traditions have shaped who we are as a society today and they also serve, I believe very strongly, as a basis for us to determine where we are going.

1520

I have also congratulated you earlier, Mr Speaker, on your election and I do again today. I and members of my caucus look forward to working with you in a spirit of co-operation, no matter how many bad rulings you might make.

There is no doubt that these are volatile times for all of us in public life, and rightly so, I say to the members. Those of us who represent the Ontario public today are here because voters delivered a message, in my view, that they are totally fed up with the politics of the past. Some of us are here in spite of that.

But I believe that was the predominant message from voters I talked to over these past two years, particularly in the past year and, of course, in the 37 days of this summer. They made it very clear in the last election that they felt the way in which our political process had been operating is no longer acceptable. People are demanding a government that is more open than it has been and a government that is seriously engaged in the business of representing people rather than simply serving the needs of politicians.

For far too long, I believe, politicians have been treating this political process, especially our government's decision-making process, like an inside baseball game. They do not understand it. I am not sure we understand it ourselves from day to day and from week to week, but the public does not. Politicians are the only players. Everybody else—the media, the public and especially taxpayers—is a spectator. They are outsiders to this game that it appears to them that we play.

By voting as overwhelmingly as they did and expressing as overwhelmingly as they have to me and voting to remove from office a short-lived government, the people have served notice, not just to the party that formed that government, but to all of us on all sides of the House, that we will get essentially the same treatment if we do not respond to what they have been telling us, if we do not begin to change.

The people told us they were fed up with what they perceived as cynical politicians. They will no longer tolerate those politicians who promise Utopia one day and then turn those dreams into dust on the next day. They will no longer tolerate politicians who attempt to manipulate the voting public through policy set by polls or by headlines, to serve only politicians themselves or to appease special interests.

I am sure, Mr Speaker, that you and other members of this House sense an unease in many quarters about the future direction and the quality of public policy. Given what has transpired since the election, I understand this public confusion. I think it is fair to say that even government members themselves here in this chamber are somewhat confused and disoriented in their first, and perhaps only, brush with this awesome responsibility of power.

In his younger days, even the Premier himself was confused, flirting with being a Trudeau Liberal by working for Charles Caccia in Davenport riding, because, as the Premier wrote at that time, he “could not stand the unbearable self-righteousness of the NDP.” Today, I suspect, the Premier has changed that view.

But I suspect, quite frankly, that the Premier still feels torn between allegiance to what I feel are radical socialists in the party he leads and his less radical socialist friends, many of them in the Liberal Party. So far, at least, he has gone out of his way to assure bankers of Wall Street and Bay Street that he wears a navy-blue suit with some accustomed ease.

He has been so accommodating in fact that he has not even referred to the Globe and Mail as “just a Toronto rag,” which was his view in 1984. So perhaps the Premier is content to have us believe that he is, as he was

described in the media the other day, a conservative progressive.

However, one cannot help but be suspicious. The agenda of this government is far more extensive than the spending of a few dollars on housing, or the raising of the minimum wage, or the other vagaries the throne speech would imply. After all, the Liberal Party is also well practised in the art of alluding to one thing and doing another. It has always throughout resulted in higher taxes, higher spending and bigger government, something which I am sure does not faze the current government.

The Premier once said as well that "public ownership is an expression of our determination to take over our economy." I am not sure if the Premier feels that the mandate he received on 6 September was one mandate that was given to take over the economy or not, but if it is, it was not the message he has handed out to the financial community so far. Nor did the Premier remind the public or the financial community of other positions put forward by his party in the past, positions which I am tempted to repeat here, but I believe they are pretty well known and I will spare all members of this government any embarrassment.

The fact is that we are facing extremely grave challenges as a province and as a government. We face a recession that is already more severe in many respects than the recession of 1981-82. That recession resulted from high inflation and high interest rates. This recession, I suggest to members, was brought about by high-spending and high-taxing government. Inflation at current levels of 5% would not on its own trigger a recession, nor does it on its own justify double-digit interest rates. What is causing high interest rates is high-spending governments, which have accumulated the highest levels of debt in recorded history.

We can argue and debate about whether a policy of high interest rates is the best policy to fight this. But what disturbs me from the government and disturbs me from the now leader of the official opposition is that no one is talking about the structural problem. They are disagreeing with the federal government as to its solution. They disagree that high interest rates is the way to fight it.

1530

I have some concerns myself and have expressed those, but what about the problem? What is causing the problem? Why are we spending all our time on debate over whether or not the solution is the right solution? The problem is big-spending, big-debt governments that we have had in this country. I tell the members that when it comes to the province of Ontario, we have led the way. We have led the way as a province in putting inflationary pressure on to this country, spending two or two and a half times the rate of inflation each and every year over the last five years; tax increases like we have never seen before in the history of this province.

What is disturbing to me is that I have not heard anything from this new government that recognizes that this indeed is the problem and that this indeed is contributing in a more significant way than any other provincial govern-

ment across this country—including the federal government—when it comes to spending. We are the worst culprits, here in this province of Ontario.

This debt, I might add, is really nothing more than deferred tax.

Mr Nixon: More than you take in that causes inflation; it's the federal deficit.

Mr Harris: I do not mind being interrupted because he is the one who says: "What's the matter with the debt? Two and a half billion? So what? What's the big deal?" We have heard this many times from the Liberal Party, and I understand that both parties I am talking about, the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, see nothing wrong with adding to debt.

The Liberal Party, in this province's biggest boom, added some \$10 billion to our debt, took it from \$30 billion to \$40 billion in a period of five years, in the biggest period of boom we have ever had sustained, over some seven years. I find that abominable. I just cannot accept that is responsible public policy.

Mr Elston: Seven years. Part of that was yours, wasn't it?

Mr Harris: The member points out that two of those years were years when my party was in power. That is an abominable record too, one I am not proud of. The fact of the matter is that I stand up and say it. He refuses to admit it and the government party refuses to admit it.

This debt is nothing more than deferred taxation. I do not think one can run around this province and say, "I am opposed to high taxes." or "I am opposed to this tax," and still be in favour of a deficit, which is deferred, even higher taxation. That is not being upfront. That is not being straight with the voters. If you believe that deficit financing is okay and high deficits are not a problem, then you are saying high taxes are not a problem. You cannot have it both ways.

This is deferred taxation that we are putting in a most irresponsible way, in my view, on the shoulders of our children and our grandchildren.

I believe it will come, but I am surprised that to date the young people are not taking to the streets and saying, "Look at this mess you have left for us, over \$400 billion of debt federally, \$40 billion-plus provincially just in the province of Ontario."

I do not believe there is any more fundamental principle I believe in than paying one's own way; we have an obligation to pay our own way, to not take out of the economy more than we are prepared to pay for, to not say to the next generation, "Sorry, both fiscally with the debt and environmentally we were not prepared to pay our own way and we've left you with this mess to clean up."

For any part that my time in public life has contributed to that, I apologize to those young people and I say to those young people: "There is a party that is speaking on your behalf. There is a party that accepts as one of the fundamental principles we must adhere to that we have no right to take the environment or to take the dollars and spend them on ourselves and leave you with the legacy of cleaning up."

We have no right to take a plant and 50 jobs because we wanted those jobs today and then say to young people: "Sorry, you clean up the mess. We weren't prepared to pay for that at the same time." We have no right to spend \$2.5 billion more than we are prepared to tax ourselves for the right of spending that money.

It is commonplace for provincial governments to try to blame the federal government, but the provinces have been the net beneficiaries of excessive taxation through transfer payments, through regional equalization grants, through the UIC and other federal programs. I am appalled that nowhere in this throne speech does the government acknowledge that it has any responsibility whatsoever for the serious economic plight Canada finds itself in.

I am also appalled by the total lack of any hint of initiatives to address the immediate need for public and private sector corporations to be competitive. There is not a hint of that in the throne speech. I submit that it is our lack of competitiveness, burdened by high taxation and unwarranted government intervention, that is costing this province investment and jobs at the expense of tax-paying families.

Employment is and should be of concern to all Ontarians during this difficult period, but government must learn that full employment should not equate to having five people doing the job of one. That is surely a short-term solution that will lead to the loss of all of our jobs. Jobs flow from prosperity. Prosperity results from successful enterprise in a highly competitive global economy, where governments co-operate both with business and with each other to remove trade restraints and artificial trading boundaries and by enhancing the free flow of goods and services.

Responsible governments provide education and trade training programs based on a standard of excellence, yet this throne speech says nothing at all about improving the quality of educational programs; nothing at all. Nor is there any reference in this throne speech to the gifted, to the entrepreneur, to the creative mind or to the need to enhance personal growth and development.

The government did spell out its desire to establish a Fair Tax Commission. I predict that this commission will not recommend one single reduction in our overall tax burden, not one, because I have not heard this party in opposition, have not heard this party now in government say that it is even a problem, this overall tax burden.

In fact, more to the point, the Treasurer believes that there is still room to tax. He said that the companies are not leaving this province, so obviously there is room to tax them some more. I do not know which companies he is talking to. Obviously the ones that are not leaving—but he perhaps should take up a point at the border east of us and west of us to provinces to our east and to our west and to the United States to the south of us, because I suggest that there are more companies searching for a competitive place to do business, and that is not Ontario.

From what I can deduce, the entire focus of the NDP concept of tax fairness is more taxes: "Is there some little place where we are missing that we could squeak out and

squeeze out some more money?" I have never heard a suggestion in this throne speech or from the New Democratic Party, from its current leader and Premier, that taxes are too high.

I want to make a few comments as well on the remarks that were made by the former Treasurer, now Leader of the Opposition. In his comments on the response to this throne speech, the former Treasurer said some very revealing things to me. For example, when we were talking about the \$700 million, and he referred to it—this is the \$700-million announcement that the government has announced in the throne speech. We still have not been able to determine whether it is new money or old money or out of the slush fund or where it comes from.

1540

The point I want to get at is that the Leader of the Opposition says, "I was interested in the exchange with the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party when the Treasurer was asked where the \$700 million was coming from." He says that is a relatively easy answer: "It's about three days' revenue." You see, \$700 million means nothing to the former Treasurer or to the Liberal Party of Ontario. It is just three days' revenue. What is \$700 million? Then he proceeded to criticize the government. "Let's get spending it faster. Let's get spending more of it."

It is \$700 million that they do not have. It is not three days' revenue. With the \$2.5 billion deficit and the new spending that the government wishes to bring in, and now the new billion dollars that is going to be required for the hospitals and all the others, it is three days' revenue as long as there are 600 days in the year. But there are not 600 days in the year. The revenue only comes in for 365 days and that money is spent, gone.

Now they have borrowed another \$2.5 billion, so they tell us, to meet the commitments of the former government. But for the Leader of the Opposition, of the Liberal Party, to piddle on \$700 million, that that is only three days' revenue, is a very, very telling statement. It points out the difference, I suggest to you, Mr Speaker, between I and my party and the other two parties in this chamber.

Mr Nixon: Yes, we're grammatical.

Mr Harris: Me and my party. I will correct the grammar if he wants, too.

Even if you have it, \$700 million is a lot of money. It is money that no magic can allow you to spend when you do not have it.

The leader of the Liberal Party pointed out as well—I should say "interim leader" all the time; I know that used to bug our former leader when he was referred to as "interim leader" all the time.

Mr Eves: It won't bother Bob. He's been down this road three times.

Mr Harris: I can appreciate and understand why it does not bother the interim leader of the Liberal Party, particularly in these times.

He points out that in this budget there is \$3.2 billion of capital works already. I am not sure whether that is the case or not, because I heard announcement after announcement from the former Liberal Party on health care spending, on hospital funding. There was so much magic and figure juggling going on that I do not know whether that \$3.2 billion is in there or not. However, I know that they spent \$800 million, I believe it was, on the campaign of new hospital capital funding. They spent it in the 1985 campaign and the 1987 campaign. They told us it was in the budget every year, and not one single hospital bed was built in that period of time. So whether that amount of money is in there or not, I do not know.

There was something else that concerned me. That is this phrase that is used by the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party. The leader of the Liberal Party used it in his remarks. He talked about the relocation program and said, "Six thousand recession-proof government jobs would certainly be a boon to these communities."

I do not want to get into the relocation program, the merits and what is there. I referred, in a question earlier today, to my great concern that these were announced as—well, let's say they were very politically opportunistic. My sense was they were not costed out. My sense was there was no analysis to, ask: "Are we fulfilling our mandate of delivering government services in the most efficient way possible? Are we using tax dollars to deliver services as cheaply as possible so that we do not have to continue raising taxes?"

I still feel that. I have not heard an answer today from the minister that indicates there is any well-thought-out plan. In fact, there has been not a shred of documentation tabled. I asked for that information of the minister today, the same as the Liberal Party. He said, "Oh well, in the fullness of time, once we figure it all out, when we get all this, then we'll give you the information." They will give us the information to try to justify a decision already made.

That is what was wrong with the way it was proceeded with by the former government, and that is what is wrong with the way it is proceeding now with this government: "We are proceeding, regardless of the cost. We are proceeding, and then we'll table the figures to you as soon as we can make them up and make them look okay." I object to that. The Premier will know that I object strenuously to not sharing that information.

I know it is a commitment he has made. I would ask him to consider it in this example. When a decision is made by the government, the public, the opposition parties, the media, we are all entitled to the information that he had before him to make that decision so that we can judge whether it is a good decision or a poor decision, and the public can judge whether they agree with it on that basis.

But it is the words "recession-proof government jobs" that concern me. This is a phrase that flows so freely off the lips of so many people. The assumption is that it is recession proof. It does not matter whether you are broke, and it does not matter if you are \$2.5 billion in deficit; the government never has to be concerned about how effi-

ciently it operates. That is the message the leader of the Liberal Party is sending, that they are recession proof.

Everybody else has to lay off people. Everybody else has to cut back. Everybody else has to cut back their spending, home owners, individuals, whether they make \$5,000 a year or \$25,000 a year—there are some who make \$50,000. In a recession everybody has to cut back. Companies have to cut back, but government does not have to cut back. It is recession proof. It just keeps carrying on as if everything was rosy. It does not have to recognize, if you have a civil service job or if you are in government or if you are a politician—we have to worry every four years or three years, when somebody is really arrogant and decides to go early. But this is what concerns me.

Mr Elston: We get this for \$1,000 for the dinner?

Mr Sorbara: No dinner; just hors-d'oeuvres.

Mr Curling: Speeches.

Mr Harris: It is those types of comments that suggest to me there are two parties in this Legislature that are totally out of touch with reality, totally out of touch with the man on the street, with the worker coming home from his job with reduced expectations of whether his job is going to be there or not. I find that difficult to understand.

There were some other things, by the way, in the throne speech that specifically concern me, before I wrap up. I do not plan to be lengthy today, members will all be pleased to know.

The throne speech talked about non-profit housing, a commitment to, I think it was—I did not get the number—30,000 new units of non-profit housing. It has been pretty well documented and it has been pointed out that the former government, in its non-profit housing program, wasted billions of taxpayers' dollars, that we are all paying far too much for this housing, whether it is because there is big profit in non-profit, which I suggest there is, or whether it is because as soon as government is paying 100% of it and it is non-profit, nobody cares how much it costs. I have talked to the Premier about this. I have raised this in the House.

When the Miss Starr affair was brought up, I raised time and time again, not Miss Starr herself, not the impropriety—others can deal with that and the courts will deal with that as well. It is: Why is the temptation so big to be involved in non-profit housing? What is fundamentally wrong with the system that everybody wants a piece of this pie?

1550

As well, I pointed out the example of the luxury condominiums in Scarborough. When this issue came to light there seemed to be great consternation that the government of Ontario was subsidizing tenants, taking those who required subsidized housing off the waiting list and putting them into luxury condominiums in Scarborough.

The Ministry of Housing responded: "Well, don't you understand that this is a good deal for the government? If we build them ourselves, doing it the non-profit route, we

have to subsidize \$1,500, \$1,600 a unit,” for a standard two-bedroom box outside of Toronto. “Don’t you recognize,” the Ministry of Housing spokesman said, “what a good deal this luxury condominium is? We only have to subsidize \$700 or \$800 a unit.”

But nobody seemed to ask themselves, not the Liberal Party, not the New Democratic Party, because it blindly wants to go ahead with the same program—nobody even stopped to scratch their head and ask, “Wait a second, how is it that the private sector can build luxury condominiums in Toronto, paying the price they pay for land in Toronto, and provide them cheaper than the government can provide non-profit housing outside of Toronto?”

How could this possibly be? Nobody seems to be delving into why that is, and yet I have raised this in the House, I have pointed it out to the former government, I have pointed it out to the Premier. And what do I see in the throne speech? Well, we are going to take that great Liberal program that costs \$1,500, \$1,600 a unit each and every month for 35 years to subsidize. That is how we are going to house people.

I suggest to members that somebody is making a lot of money, or a lot of money is being wasted and frittered away. If we want to spend that many billions of dollars—I am not suggesting we should not; we have a serious problem on our hands. How does it add up that the private sector can provide two-bedroom luxury condominiums in Toronto cheaper than government can provide the standard old two-bedroom boxes across this province? Maybe we should be looking to the private sector. Maybe we could have twice or three times as many units.

Do you know the other thing with this story? That was not the angle the media came on; they were not interested in my comments. As I recall, they wanted to talk about how terrible it was that we were putting subsidized tenants alongside those who did not have to be subsidized. That did not bother me, quite frankly. It concerned me that all of a sudden 80% of one building was going that way, as opposed to a government policy that would help people who need help.

This is what happened. The government said: “We have people on this waiting list. We do not have enough non-profit units. What are we going to do?” And the private sector, because we were there with surplus capacity in luxury condominiums, was able to say, “Well, we’ll do that for half the price of your own non-profit programs.” Should we not be saying: “Let’s do more of that, let’s help twice as many people, let’s help people who need help”?

Maybe we should examine our policy of throwing billions and billions of dollars subsidizing bricks, subsidizing builders, subsidizing buildings, and go back to helping people who need help. That is what I suggest to you is the fundamental difference between my party and the other two parties in this Legislature; fundamentally, the problem with the policies they have come forward with.

I was not going to do this today, but I think I will. I want to relate the story of a man who came to me during the leadership—it could have been any one of a number

of people, because I was travelling around this province—and it had to do with rent controls.

I was asked a question in one of the public forums which my colleague the member for London North and I were delighted to participate in—others say, for some reason or other, “subjected ourselves to,” but I think we would say, on balance, delighted to participate in. This gentleman said, “I have concerns with your criticism, Mr Harris, of the current rent review policy of the government.” This gentleman felt that we needed strict rent controls. He said, “I think we need some protection for tenants.”

I said: “Well, I understand where you’re coming from. What business are you in?” He said he owned a hardware store, that he lived in an apartment and he was concerned about rents.

I said: “I appreciate your concern about rents, and I believe there is a role for government to take a look at what policies are helping or contributing to this problem. I accept that, but nobody seems to want to look at the other side, why builders don’t want to build apartment units.” So I asked the gentleman this: “You own a hardware store. How would you feel if the government came to you tomorrow and said you have to cut all your prices by 20%? And you said: ‘My profit margin is only 15%. If I cut my prices by 20%, I am going to lose 5% on everything I sell.’”

“The government came to you, and you followed that, you sold your hammers, you sold your nails and you lost 5% of your own hard-earned money that you invested and put on the line and risked; on every sale you made, you lost 5%. Finally, after a year or two, you said to yourself: ‘Well, I can’t go on losing my own money, I’m not jeopardizing my family. I’m going to go out of the hardware business.’

“And then the government came to you and said: ‘No, you can’t go out of business, sorry. You have to keep selling that stuff and losing 5%. You can’t convert your hardware store to something else. That’s the law.’”

Do you think there would be very many people wanting to invest in hardware stores in Ontario if this is what happened? Do you think there are very many people who want to invest in rental accommodation in this province? Because that is what we have said, in effect, to landlords. We said: “We will tell you what you can charge, even though you are losing money. Second, you can’t go out of business, either. You have to stay in business, you have to keep renting them, you have to keep losing money.”

The Liberal policy has not addressed that to the satisfaction, certainly, of landlords or tenants. I do not know whether the New Democratic policy will address that to the satisfaction of landlords or tenants. It is a challenge, one that if the Minister of Housing and the Premier are truly prepared to sit down and work on, I would be prepared to participate in. But as long as this is a policy, there will be no private sector involvement in the housing industry and rental accommodation. Therefore, government will have to build it all.

I ask the government, with its experience of building non-profit housing at double, sometimes triple, the cost of

what the private sector could do it for, is this the way you want to fritter taxpayers' dollars over the next five years?

I also want to comment on a point that was talked about by the leader of the Liberal Party. I am sure other members have also noted a certain tendency among the NDP to present themselves as spokespersons of a more humane society. The NDP mythology has always contained a somewhat sanctimonious self-perception, one referred to by the Premier, as I related to members in my comments when it looked like he was going to be a Liberal, that the NDP, and it alone, speaks for the poor and the disadvantaged. This mythology is reflected in the throne speech, where the government has the temerity to suggest that it will be the outsiders in from the cold. I gather that the Premier shares this view, that he too has been an outsider for far too long.

1600

The Progressive Conservative Party will challenge this proposition. We intend to challenge the notion that by limiting individual freedom through excessive taxation and an even more complex web of bureaucracy and red tape, government is actually helping outsiders. This approach will not create jobs. Mandated minimum wage increases, for example, no matter how laudable, no matter how much they might help or appear to help those who already have jobs, will do nothing to help create new jobs for those who are on the outside trying to get in.

What this and so many other principles embraced by this government do is denote privilege and special status on those who are already on the inside. It is that privilege and that special status that we must attack. It is that privilege and special status that we must remove, especially those on the inside with the NDP, and even more specifically, I suggest, at the time of a recession.

My party led this province for more than four consecutive decades. We provided sound and effective leadership during periods of enormous economic growth as well as periods of economic contraction. We faced the challenge of reconstruction following the Second World War. We led Ontario under the economic downturns of the mid-1960s and of the mid-1970s. We provided sound and effective leadership during the recession of the early 1980s. Despite all these challenges, we built an educational system that produced many of today's world business, legal, cultural and intellectual leaders. We had affordable homes. We had hospitals from which no one was turned away. We had an industrial base here in this province that brought wealth to workers as well as to investors. This was all possible while still maintaining a taxation base that was envied in many quarters of the world.

Today my party will take its responsibilities here in this Legislature and beyond the walls of this Legislature no less seriously. We will provide the people of Ontario with a vigorous opposition, with a clear alternative to high taxing, big spending, interventionist government represented by both the other parties in this House, and a clear and commonsense alternative to any other parties in this Legislature who practise and who promote it.

I think it is customary at this time: I wish to move an amendment to the amendment to this throne speech.

The Speaker: Mr Harris moves that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session be amended by adding the following thereto:

"4. for its failure to commit to a policy of restraint designed to control the growth and cost of government and to reduce the tax burden on its citizens;

"5. for its failure to recognize and act on the necessity of building a new financial partnership with Ontario's municipalities;

"6. for its failure to articulate any measures to respond to the aging of Ontario's population;

"7. for its failure to advance a coherent regional development policy;

"8. for its failure to recognize the crisis facing Ontario's agricultural community and its lack of commitment to preserve farm land and provide interest rate relief for farmers."

Mr B. Ward: It is an honour to be here among my colleagues, for whom I have great respect, on both sides of the House.

It has been suggested that this government is a democratic socialist government or a social democratic government or other names that the opposition may think of from time to time. Whatever people want to call us, we are, for the first time, a government representing the average working person in Ontario and I am very proud to be part of this historic event.

As the representative for Brantford, I am happy to be here to express my satisfaction for the social and economic direction that this government will take now and in the future. I am very pleased to see the speech from the throne address a number of areas that are of great concern to the people of Ontario and the city of Brantford in particular.

As you know, Brantford, like Windsor and other communities, has been hammered by the recession. The current recession has been caused, in large part, by the misguided economic policies of the federal Conservative government. Every day there seems to be notice of another plant closure or a layoff. That is why I feel this government made the right choice in battling the recession, in attempting to cushion the economic hardship that working people are experiencing.

The \$700-million commitment towards public works projects is an excellent way to provide short-term relief. These projects will not only employ many of the people who have been thrown out of work through plant closure, layoffs or bankruptcies but will have a lasting effect on our communities. The projects will not simply consist of digging holes and filling them but will help improve the province's infrastructure which has been neglected for years and constantly underfunded.

Along with the capital works projects, the throne speech includes a commitment to ensure that as our economy restructures, the burden of change does not fall solely upon the workers and their communities.

I am pleased that we will create a wage protection fund for workers of bankrupt companies, support labour adjustment committees, introduce stronger measures on layoff notice, severance and other adjustment issues.

It is my belief that we must do more to train and retrain the workforce to meet the economic challenges of the 1990s and into the 21st century. Therefore, I was very happy to see the commitment in the throne speech to upgrade skills training programs.

The progress that will be made by this government towards social justice will finally lead Ontario away from the corporate agenda of the 1980s towards a more compassionate society. A fairer tax system, pension reforms, improved rent review and tenant protection and increases in the supply of affordable housing and child care spaces are initiatives that will lead to a better quality of life for all of Ontario's people.

In closing, I believe this government was elected because we made a commitment to the people of Ontario to provide open and honest government and to consult with and listen to the people. We will keep that commitment. The people of Ontario have placed a trust in us and we must not, we will not, fail them.

1610

Mr Henderson: This throne speech proves that Harry Houdini is alive and well in the spirit of the New Democratic Party government of Ontario. This throne speech is the greatest disappearing act since Harry Houdini. This throne speech is a masterpiece of now you see it, now you don't. For that, this government can certainly claim credit. We knew a lot more about the positions of this NDP government last month than we do this month.

The NDP leader made promises about education. Last month we knew what the NDP would do about children attending school in cramped portable classrooms and washing their hands in communal buckets at the back of the class. Last week we knew that the NDP would boost the provincial government's contribution to education spending to 60% over a five-year period. What do we know this month? We heard that our future somehow depends on how we care for our children. These are hardly bold words, hardly the promises that will comfort worried parents or reassure exasperated educators or inspire pupils.

The NDP leader made promises about pensions. Last month, Ontario's senior citizens, who live on meagre company pensions of a couple of hundred dollars a month and who could not afford to see a Blue Jays game or watch a concert or maybe even enjoy a decent meal and have a decent home, knew that the Premier had promised a retroactive law to index pensions to the inflation rate—not just a law, but a retroactive law. What did they hear in this throne speech? They heard that reports on advocacy for the frail elderly have been gathering dust for too long. Harry Houdini had done his thing.

The NDP leader made promises about housing. Last month we knew what the NDP was going to do about housing in Ontario. Rents would be controlled, with an

annual fixed increase tied to inflation; 20,000 non-profit affordable units of housing would be created every year. Home ownership programs would be created for moderate-income families with a 10.5% ceiling on mortgage rates and access to registered retirement savings funds. The Ontario Mortgage Corp would become a direct lender of housing funds. The property tax system would be restructured and property tax credits would be increased. Tenants would have control over maintenance in their buildings and programs would help tenants buy their own buildings. Now, after the throne speech, we must be content to hope that the Premier will indeed help to expand the supply of affordable housing, particularly non-profit housing. That kind of pillow talk gives little comfort to the thousands of Ontarians who live below the poverty line and who struggle on social assistance, little comfort to the working poor, little comfort to Ontario's construction sector and little comfort to Ontario's apartment dwellers who face eviction. What happened to those promises? Gone with the wind. Ask Harry Houdini where those promises went.

The NDP made promises about arts and culture. This throne speech was especially disappointing to Ontarians who love the arts and culture and hope for at least a few scant crumbs of comfort to be offered to the supporters of Metropolitan Toronto's ballet opera house. Karen Kain put it well in an open letter to the NDP a few days after the government reneged on Ontario's \$55-million commitment to the ballet opera house. Building this ballet opera house, she said, would provide important jobs in the hard-pressed construction industry; 1,500 new housing units, half of them affordable; 1,000 jobs on stage and off for the artistic community, and would attract tourist dollars by the millions to Ontario.

Karen Kain pointed out something else. In times of stress, mankind derives great solace from the finest outpourings of human creativity, because we need food for our hearts and for our minds and for our souls. After the Second World War, when Vienna lay in ruins, the first priority of the Austrian people was to rebuild the opera house in Vienna, because they knew what culture meant to their spirits and to their hearts. Continued support for the ballet opera house in these recessionary times would be an act of enlightenment, vision and hope.

The NDP was the great hope for artists and performers and lovers of the arts and culture. Arts and culture strike to the very heart of health and vitality in our community. The government should never treat the arts as expendable.

Last month we thought we knew that the Premier would create an arts and government advisory committee and increase his support to the arts and culture from year to year by the rate of inflation. He had promised to ensure income security for artists, to exempt artists' materials and their work from provincial sales tax, to press the federal government for tax changes to help lower-income artists and to support funding for artists' co-operatives for the production and sale of their work.

Last month we thought we knew about the NDP's commitment to the arts and culture. We did not always agree with what the NDP stood for, but we respected its

integrity. Ontario's artists and performers believed the NDP government would keep its word.

What happened to all those promises? What do we know this month? The Premier assures us that he recognizes the importance of the arts to the economy and to the quality of our lives. That is pillow talk. That is what the Premier used to call "weasel words" in this House. Those words are very small comfort to Ontario's artists and performers, very small comfort to the construction sector, very small comfort to the homeless, very small comfort to our beleaguered tourism industry and very small comfort to Ontarians who long for world-class culture.

It is not good enough just to know that this Premier recognizes the importance of the arts. What is he going to do to support the arts? Where did NDP integrity and NDP commitment to the arts get hidden? Ask Harry Houdini about that one too. It is part of the great new NDP disappearing act.

There is a story about the NDP leader that goes something like this: The member for York South had died and gone to meet his Maker and arrived at the pearly gates. St Peter looked at the member for York South and looked at his record and turned thumbs down. He sent him to that other place—and I do not mean the Senate. A few days later he got a long-distance phone call from Satan, and Satan said: "St Peter, you have to help me with this guy from York South." St Peter said: "No way. He was up here three weeks ago. We canvassed opinion and the answer is definitely no." "But St Peter," said the Devil, "this York South guy has been here just three weeks and already he has shut down four burners."

There is a message in that story. This government has mastered the Harry Houdini shutdown act. This throne speech is a masterpiece of sleight of hand and disappearance. Look at all that has disappeared: commitment to pension reform and retroactive indexed pensions; a boost to the province's contribution to education to 60% over five years and an end to crowded portables; a promise to hold rent increases to an annual fixed rate; 20,000 new affordable housing units every year; home ownership programs; ceilings on mortgage rates; programs to put tenants in charge of maintenance and to help tenants buy their buildings, and the traditional NDP commitment to culture and the arts.

1620

Where have those commitments gone? They are all of them gone—gone with the wind, gone and disappeared, the greatest disappearing act since Harry Houdini. The Premier's bag of tricks is even bigger than Houdini's.

I want to close by paraphrasing some very immortal words of the new minister responsible for francophone affairs. In the spirit of generosity he once extended to a Liberal cabinet minister, I want to give this government and this throne speech full marks. I give them 100%: 50% in English and 50% in French.

This throne speech is a giant step towards confusion and obfuscation. We knew a great deal more about what this government was going to do before it came to office and chose to speak. In government, we Liberals were not

perfect and perhaps we even made a mistake or two, but rarely did we retreat behind platitudes and generalities. Rarely in politics does a speech offer as little substantive as this one does. They have a long way to go.

Mr Carr: I would like to take a quick moment to thank the veteran members of this Legislature for the help and support that they have given the new members as we begin this new session. I sincerely appreciate the help of my colleagues, as well as the members of the official opposition and on the government side in making the new members feel welcome.

Having said that, the reason I entered the political world from the business sector was because I was disappointed, discouraged and, in fact, angry with the direction that this province was taking. I had grown up in the greatest province and the greatest country on earth. We had the best health care system in the world; we now have waiting lists. We had the finest education system; we are now falling farther and farther behind the rest of the world. Our environment was clean and safe; now the garbage piles up and our lakes are polluted.

This throne speech fails to even recognize that, as the world changes, we too must change to prosper. This government, which so passionately cares for the poor, fails to recognize that the best way to help the poor is to ensure that those people have the skills and education to compete in the world.

I say to the Premier and the Minister of Colleges and Universities and the Minister of Education that the standard of living of our children in the future will be in direct proportion to the skill levels that we give them today. I say to the Minister of Education that her greatest challenge will not be beating David Peterson; her greatest challenge will be ensuring that our youth have the education and skills not only to compete with the kids from Newfoundland and British Columbia but to compete with the kids from the United States, France, now the united Germanys and Japan.

It was not too long ago that we never thought there would be machines that would replace the tellers. As we sit here today, on almost every street corner there are now machines that count out money. Even more incredible now is a project in the United States where a fast-food outlet now has a highly advanced machine which will cook and dispense hamburgers and french fries faster than 30 people can do it. This machine had displaced 30 workers. One individual making \$32 per hour, with a bonus of \$30,000 to start, has replaced 30 North American workers.

The sad part about this situation is that the machine is so highly technically advanced that it is not produced in North America. That machine in fact is produced in Japan. The skills necessary to run this machine are such that they demand high wages. The sad part is, there is no worker in North America capable of running the machine. The worker making \$32 an hour plus a \$30,000-a-year bonus is Japanese; 30 North American workers are replaced by one machine and one worker, both of them imported from Japan.

As I review this throne speech, there is nothing in it that would lead me to believe that this government even recognizes that a problem exists, let alone knows how to fix it. As I review the throne speech and see pay equity, I see that it will not help workers who lose their jobs to high technology. If the women of this province are given the skills to be able to compete, they will be able to command the high wages necessary to run machines such as these. In the throne speech it talks about increasing the minimum wage, but if technology advances as fast as it has, the minimum wage jobs will be lost to modern technology. The best thing we can do for the minimum wage workers is ensure that they have the skills to be able to compete, because as I say, those with the minimum skills are going to be the ones who are going to be unemployed. In the future, we will not even be able to count on jobs at the fast-food restaurants as the technology changes. The recent action by this government on maternity leave for workers will mean nothing if there are no jobs from which to take leave.

As I review this government's outline, I become frightened. I am frightened because we have met the enemy and he is us. We in this province are heading in the wrong direction in our quest to help the less fortunate. This government, sadly, does not even recognize the problem. As I see the challenges I am concerned, because just like the Titanic, we face disaster. There is this big iceberg on the horizon and those in charge of the ship, the newly elected government, have decided to shuffle the deck chairs instead of doing what is right and changing the direction for this province. In fact, some are not only shuffling the deck chairs and deciding who is going to get the loungers; some are even calling to the Premier: "Full speed ahead. Darn the torpedoes; full speed ahead." They are doing the very things that will hurt the people of this province in the long run.

A plant in my riding, Tridon, is leaving this province to go to Tennessee. They are going to a state where there are no laws to force workers to join a union. In this throne speech it says, "We will ensure that workers can freely exercise their right to organize." In fact, Tridon is automotive related and it right now is operating in a free trade environment. I say to those people who are yelling about free trade that 80% of the goods coming into this country before free trade were coming in duty-free.

Tridon is leaving because of the high cost of doing business here, including taxes. So what does this government do? It creates a fund which helps the workers who lose their jobs, which is an admirable goal, but what it will do is force a lot of companies, at the time when they are being uncompetitive, to pay into another system. As I look at this, we are treating the symptoms instead of trying to find a cure. I say that if the Titanic goes down, the people who will get to the lifeboats will not be the poor and disadvantaged. The ones getting off the sinking ship will be the ones who have the skills required by the rest of the world. Again, in the long run, this government is hurting those it so passionately wants to help. I am reminded of an old saying about socialism: "If you're not a socialist by the time you're 18, you don't have a heart,

and if you're still a socialist by the time you're 30, you don't have a brain."

In other countries they are not shuffling the deck chairs on the Titanic; they are working with industry to make themselves more competitive, and I say "competitive" is not a dirty word. The people of Ontario, indeed all Canadians, need to know that without the skills and abilities and training essential in the new information age, good people will not be able to have gainful employment. The world is a global village with determined, well-educated and powerful competitors. We compete with them for international standing in markets, not only in products and services but in ideas and brainpower. The people of this province have the capability to compete. What we do not have is the leadership of this government to take long-term solutions to many difficult questions. We in Ontario should respect other nations, but we should fear no one.

1630

In a few short years, current projections indicate that Bell-Northern Research alone will be able to hire all the electrical engineers that Canadian universities produce. In addition, the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers estimates that there will be a shortage of 30,000 engineers. Some 30% of the full-time employees in Canada believe that if they lost their jobs tomorrow, they would not have the proper education, training and experience to find an attractive alternative.

By the year 2000, 40% of the new jobs in Canada will require abilities such as computing and thinking. One of the job requirements will probably include having a college degree. It is estimated that in the 1990s almost two thirds of the new jobs acquired will require 12 years of education. Many of the new jobs will even, in fact, include 17 years of education.

Indeed, we have met the enemy and he is us. It is little wonder, as I look at this throne speech, that people are cynical about politicians when they see this government saying, "We will establish measures to ensure more fairness in appointments to government agencies, boards and commissions." Yet the first appointments go to long-time NDP supporters such as Bob White and Bruce Kidd.

It is little wonder, seeing this government backtrack on so many promises, that the people of this province say they do not trust politicians. In fact, they look at it and say, "Even Bob Rae, who we thought stood for principles above all else, is just like the rest of them."

In the throne speech it says: "It is our job to address that cynicism and to overcome it. When my government makes mistakes, it will admit them." I say to the Premier of this province that he has a duty to admit that this throne speech is a mistake, that the direction this province is taking is wrong, and then change the emphasis of this government to ensure the prosperity of all our residents.

I say to the government that it should do it quickly, because the iceberg is looming larger and larger every day. It should not steer Ontario into disaster. The people of this province are counting on this government.

Mr Sutherland: It is indeed a pleasure and an honour for me to be able to stand here to represent the

riding of Oxford. As some members may know, Oxford has a strong mix of a very healthy agricultural community and a strong manufacturing base. Its agriculture is very diverse, made up of dairy, tobacco, beef, pork and vegetable growers, all kinds of different aspects of agriculture. It also likes to proclaim itself as the dairy capital of Canada.

Oxford heritage is lengthy and goes back a long way. It was primarily developed by British immigrants from England, Scotland and different areas. I am proud of the fact that my forefathers came to Oxford county in 1852 and that our family has seen fit to stay in this wonderful community. In the postwar era, there was much more immigration into the area, a lot of that being Dutch and European. Those people have added a great deal to the community and to the riding.

I want to talk today about the throne speech, what is in it, what is not in it and what a throne speech is supposed to be. I have listened intently to many members of the other parties and people at large commenting that this isn't in the throne speech and that isn't in the throne speech. Let's try to define what a throne speech is supposed to be about.

Is it supposed to announce every government policy and all the specifics related to that policy, or is it supposed to provide goals, direction, for everybody? I think a throne speech is supposed to provide the goals and direction. If we were to believe the members of the opposition as to what should be in this throne speech, then the Lieutenant Governor would still be reading the throne speech today because, simply put, the members of the opposition have constantly suggested that everything should have been there, every specific, every nuance of every policy. That is not what a throne speech is about.

We have also heard members of the opposition quote the Agenda for People from the election campaign and say that we have not kept the commitments in the Agenda for People. I have a copy of the Agenda for People here and I have looked at the different headings in the Agenda for People. There were 26 of them. In the throne speech, 23 of those 26 are made reference to. So I do not believe the opposition can claim that we are not keeping the commitment that we made to our agenda in the election. We have made reference to them. We have pointed out the direction we want to go.

I want to focus in on a few specific areas in the throne speech. We have heard a lot of comments from members of the opposition, how it does not focus in on skills development, how it does not talk about training, and we just heard a fellow colleague talk at some length about that. I would like to quote a paragraph from the throne speech: "Our human resources will be key to our economic future. To face the challenge of the 1990s effectively, we must become a learning society where education and training are seen as fundamental to individual growth, where investment in people is understood to be as important as investment in capital or in research and development. My government will work with labour, business, community organizations and the educational sector to create new education and training partnerships.

Strong, publicly funded institutions are crucial to lifelong education."

Is that a strong commitment to training and development? Clearly, some members of the opposition were not listening to the Lieutenant Governor or have not read the throne speech carefully enough to indicate that.

Other members of the opposition have talked about what makes a country competitive, and they have gone on and they have said that we are leading this province down the road of doom because we want to do things such as pay equity, because we want to increase the minimum wage to a workable living wage.

I would like to quote some of the things that a noted economist, Michael Porter, who is at Harvard, has recently announced in a book of his about what makes nations competitive. Here are some of the things he highlights. Mr Porter has been hired by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business to study Canada's economy, to see how competitive it is. The things included "a strong science and research base, a good educational system, good health care and housing, modern telecommunications." He also highlights demand conditions: "This means customers who set high standards and force industries to meet these standards. It includes governments setting high standards for product quality and safety. Companies that satisfy demanding customers at home are better able to compete in the rest of the world."

He also mentions government regulation, and I quote from the article again: "Government regulation—from environmental controls and workplace safety to product standards and energy efficiency—can force industry to develop products ahead of companies in other countries. Sweden has done this through tough rules on workplace safety and the environment, and Japan has done the same thing with its emphasis on energy efficiency in autos and other industries."

Our government has made a commitment to energy efficiency. Our government has made a commitment to strong regulations because we believe that new industries and new technology can come out of that. Clearly, the directions outlined in the throne speech seem to be in line with what this noted professor of economics at Harvard is saying. So, for opposition members to sit there and say that this government does not know anything about competitiveness, maybe they should have a talk with Mr Porter and maybe they should have a talk with the Canadian Federation of Independent Business which has hired this gentlemen to help study the Canadian economy.

1640

I want to compliment our government for also addressing the issue of a common pause day. As one who has worked in the retail sector and worked through high school and university to put myself through university—

Mrs Cunningham: Kimble, that's unusual. That's dangerous, Kimble. That's even tough for our party to come to grips with. What are you going to do?

Mr Sutherland: —I want to say that I think it is extremely important that we have a common pause day.

Studies—and I am sure my colleague the member for London North, who is very involved with education, will concur with this—have shown that when high school students or university students are working more than 12 or 13 hours a week, it affects their education.

Clearly, if we do not have a common pause day, it is going to be many high school students who are going to have to work on Sundays, and that is going to take them over that 12 hours a week. We have heard many people say how they are concerned about the quality of education. If we want our young people to do well, we need to have a common pause day.

We need a common pause day to preserve our family life and to help enhance it. We all know there are certainly many distractions on family life now, and I think it is important that we have a common pause day for everybody.

I believe the leader of the third party has been quoted as being in favour of Sunday shopping, as trying to say that it helps make us more competitive or it means more profits. It simply does not. All you are doing is changing profits from those companies that do not want to open up on Sunday to those that do.

As for those who believe it may create more employment, it simply does not, because if people are shopping on Sunday, then they are not shopping on Monday and Tuesday and hours are going to be cut. Hours may be shifted, but there is not going to be any more employment created by having Sunday shopping.

I want to talk about another issue. The leader of the third party mentioned earlier about how the young people should be in the streets complaining about deficits and debts. During the election campaign the young people I ran into were telling me that they are very concerned about the environment, and with good reason. They are concerned about what the environment is going to be when they grow up and have families and children of their own.

I am very pleased that our government has made a strong commitment in the throne speech to deal with environmental issues—not just a haphazard measure such as having soft drink refillable companies help sponsor a blue box program, but a true commitment to reduction, recycling and reusing as well as the environmental bill of rights and the Safe Drinking Water Act. All of those things are strong commitments to environmental protection. That is what many of our young people are very concerned about in this day and age.

Finally, I also want to say that I am very pleased that we have made reference to the problems that affect this country and the constitutional malaise that we seem to be in. This country is drifting apart, and I think all of us agree that we need to try and bring this country back, to unite it once again as a strong country, though we recognize many people's interests and concerns.

During the month of May I happened to be unemployed and I had the fortune or misfortune, depending upon how you want to look at it, of watching the daily reports coming off Newsworld of what was going on with our country. It was an extremely frustrating experience to

sit there and watch the TV and see our leaders letting our country go apart, extremely frustrating for me as an individual, and I am sure many other people in this province also found it extremely frustrating as those 11 people tried to decide the whole country's future and did not let people participate and join in.

Let me say this as well about the throne speech: It does not have everything in there for everybody. It does not have everything I would like to see. I am sure it does not have everything in it that other members of my party would like to see, that ministers would like to see, or even that the Premier would like to see.

But clearly, given the realities of the time, the fact that we are in a recession caused by high interest rates and free trade, the throne speech has still committed this government to a strong reform agenda, to making things better for the people of this province in the long run and balancing that out with the economic realities of the time.

I am very proud of the throne speech and I am very proud to be part of the government that has put forward this agenda.

Mr Chiarelli: I want to congratulate the member for Oxford on his maiden speech, but I have to take great exception to some of his comments, particularly the so-called commitments that the NDP have and any claims he has that there are specifics in the throne speech. I want to refer particularly to the Minister of Financial Institutions who, through his filibuster and lengthy diatribes in committee, consistently said that he and his party would support, for example, the right of innocent victims to sue as a result of motor vehicle accidents.

The reality is that this person accepted a responsibility in cabinet. Even after being appointed to cabinet, this particular minister stated, and I am quoting from a prepared speech, that “a public, driver-owned, non-profit insurance system with access to courtrooms for injured victims” is basically what he was supporting.

He stated after he was a minister that he wanted access to courtrooms for injured victims; now he is now totally backtracking on that. He is saying he will look at all kinds of systems; he will look at no-fault systems. He accepted his responsibility as minister on the basis of a right to sue for innocent victims and he has totally backtracked. The actual commitments of this minister and this government, in point of fact, are not worth a pinch of possum poop.

Mr Sutherland: Let me just address the issue this member has brought up and say that if you look at the throne speech and listen to the comments that have been made both by the Premier and the minister responsible, they are saying that we still have the commitment to that policy. All we want to do is make sure that we consult with people, that we listen to people to ensure that it is implemented in the most effective way possible. To me that is just good government.

Mr Curling: First I would like to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment as Deputy Speaker and the great respect we have for you in this House. We know

that you will of course carry out your duties in a way that we will all appreciate.

I am not one to be excited about throne speeches, not at all. I find them boring, full of platitudes, vague and, most of the time, saying nothing. This throne speech did not surprise me at all, although there were two statements in the throne speech that caught my ear. First is the one which states, "This speech is about principles." The second one says, "But it is also about the realities that must guide our decisions."

These realities are not new realities. There were here all along when the NDP members were coming up with their plans and proposals. All of the realities that they are now speaking about were here all along, and I am pleased that they are now mature enough to acknowledge reality.

Actually, to be fair, the NDP did acknowledge that Ontario was in a recession as far back as mid-August when it announced strategies for coping with the recession in its Agenda for People. So imagine my surprise to hear them speak about the recession as an excuse for inaction, as if it caught them completely unawares.

1650

The New Democratic government in its throne speech says, and it is important that I quote from this: "My government's integrity will be measured by the way this government is run and our relations with the people we serve. Our task is to guard against institutional arrogance and the abuse of power wherever they exist."

As recently as two days ago, I read in the paper that the Minister of Government Services had a TV show, and using her prerogative as the minister—there is a by-election going on now in ward 8 in this city—brought her NDP colleague on the show to promote that "abuse," it says, "of power wherever they exist." Yet, integrity being measured by the way they run themselves, I think that is blatant arrogance in its form.

In the resolution of the New Democratic Party at its 1988 convention, it is stated: "Be it resolved that the Ontario New Democratic Party sees environmental assessment as an absolute necessity. All new projects, processes and products must be assessed for their environmental impact and approved before they are allowed to proceed or to be used.

"Be it further resolved"—this is the part that grabs me; and I know, Mr Speaker, as you sit in that chair and listen to this, how appalled you are—"that there will be no further exemption by politicians."

My colleagues in the New Democratic government recall that the Minister of the Environment sat there and said, "I'm going to exercise my power as a minister when the exemption time comes, should we have to open another dump site should there be an excess." Abuse, again. Remember, no politician should use that power in order to make any exemptions. Yet, in a short time, here is what they are saying.

So it is what is not in the throne speech, as my honourable friend the member for Oxford stated; there are many things not in the throne speech. As I said, I am not at all surprised that they are not there.

I want to concentrate on two errors of the throne speech that should be there. One error is that it said, "our human resources will be key to our economic future." About our most important resource is our people. Some very lovely statements were made here. But the reality of Ontario, the reality of Canada, is that 25% of our adults are functionally illiterate; it depends on whose statistics you are reading. That is more than five million adults in this country who are functionally illiterate. I would hope the throne speech would address that provincial disgrace, that we have so many people who are functionally illiterate.

I read that the Premier made a statement to the library association as recently as last night. He asked them to be leaders in the cause of eradicating illiteracy. I would say the volunteers have done a tremendous amount of work in bringing to the attention of governments—my government, the Liberal government at the time, and also the Conservative government when it was in power—to recognize that national disgrace of functional illiteracy in this country and in this province.

A bit of movement happened when the Liberal government was in place, and I could hope the NDP government had made some better statements and made some other moves than asking the volunteer sector to take on more. They will take on more as we fight, as I said, this national disgrace.

The other topic I would like to raise is the topic of employment equity and pay equity. I will just make a comment about the statement by the Attorney General I read in the papers the other day. He was making the comment with regard to appointing more women as justices of the peace, that his main objective is to bring in more women as justices of the peace. I must commend him, of course; that is a good direction to go.

It is his next statement that surprised me. He stated: "If I am not able to find women in this province, I will go outside the province to find women to fill those roles." I will say this—and I am prepared to debate this any time in here or outside—about affirmative action, pay equity and employment equity: Every time we bring in these new legislation or policy discussions about it, it becomes a women's issue. We say we want to bring in more people to partake in this province who have been shut out, women, of course, but also visible minorities and the disabled. Now the Attorney General is stating that as soon as he cannot find enough women here he will not look beyond to see if the disabled or visible minorities could participate as justices of the peace but will go outside the province to find more women.

It is a shame and narrow thinking by the Attorney General. There is a lot of time to recover, after all the mistakes he has made in such a short time: I ask him to look beyond his narrow perspective.

In the throne speech, with regard to employment equity, the Premier through the lips of the Lieutenant Governor stated that more consultation will be done. You were here, Mr Speaker. You heard him. Not only that; when the leader was in opposition—I want the member from Oxford, if he has not, to look back in those files—Bill 172

was introduced by the now Premier of this province. He was saying that the Liberal government was too slow in bringing about employment equity. And what did he do? He said: "I will put the private member's bill before you right now." In his very eloquent way, the statement he put forward was, "This bill is a result of a long period of discussion and consultation with a number of groups as well as individuals across the province, members active in the visible minority community, the disabled community, women's groups, native groups, as well as people from the labour movement." What did he state then in the House afterwards, in the throne speech? Further consultation.

There are two ways he can do this. He could scratch the private member's stuff out and reintroduce Bill 172 as a new bill, because he said he had done all his consultation. But now he wants to have further consultation, dragging his feet. As he said, it is a matter of principles and reality. I presume the reality has come home, that he has now seen he will not do that, or that his expectations of what he could do he will not be able to do.

I will give notice, then, because I do not think I have to do much work on all this, that Bill 172 could be reintroduced. If the honourable member would not like to do that, I think it is a good guiding force that maybe, as the critic for that area of human rights, I could look at whether that could be used again. I challenge him. Bring that bill forward now and do the employment equity right now on all this. Do not postpone it for another time in the future, because we want it now, people who are locked out and do not have access to it, even before pay equity becomes the great effect that it should do, because the government knows what pay equity is all about. I believe in pay equity, as the members all sit there. Pay equity is about dealing with people who are now in the system, who have had jobs, to share that money up.

But I would warn the business community and I warn all the union representatives who are now sitting in the

House, if they do believe in employment equity, those who are knocking at the door to come in, who are qualified—those women, those disabled individuals, those native people who are qualified—to open the door and then they can make an assessment of people who are qualified. They ask for no further thing. They ask for no special privilege. They ask to be treated fairly before the government shares that money up, because employment equity itself is about access. That is what it is about.

Of course, I believe very, very strongly in pay equity, that people should be paid for the work they do. So I will challenge the new government not to postpone it. It does remind me very much of the dog who chases the car. As soon as the car stops, the dog is confused. "How the dickens do I drive this thing? What do I do with it, now that it is stopped?" The government members have chased this thing for years. They wanted to be the government. They saw the ideas and they said: "Listen, if we were the government, this is what we would do. We would set all this out. We would lay out our agenda."

As a matter of fact, we were the only people who had a proper agenda in the election. The NDP bragged about it; then they should implement it. They said, "Oh, we can't." This is reality itself. I am not at all happy with what this government is doing so far.

They stated, "We cherish multiculturalism, a multiracial diversity, and we will work to preserve it and to benefit from it." Who will benefit? The fact is, when we decide to cherish and preserve it, most of the people who are locked out of this are very much the minorities. We must make sure that we preserve the multicultural community that has developed, that we consult with it and that in that way the benefits do not go to those who already have great benefits.

On motion by Mr Curling, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1703.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Monday 26 November 1990

Members' statements

Ministry mailing	2163
Mr Daigeler	
Gasoline prices	2163
Mr Jordan	
Grassroots	2163
Mr Sutherland	
Literacy	2163
Mr Curling	
Rental accommodation	2164
Mr Tilson	
Rest homes	2164
Mr Christopherson	
Northern health services	2164
Mr Miclash	
Highway safety	2164
Mr Arnott	
Sault Ste Marie	2165
Mr Martin	

Statements by the ministry

Transit services	2165
Mr Philip	
Pension funds	2167
Mr Rae	

Responses

Pension funds	2167
Mr Chiarelli	
Transit services	2167
Mrs Sullivan	
Pension funds	2168
Mr Harris	
Transit services	2168
Mr Arnott	

Oral questions

Constitutional reform	2169
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Scott	
Economic outlook	2170
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Decentralization of government operations	2171

Mr Harris	
Ms Lankin	
Waste management	2172
Mr Cousens	
Mr Rae	
Mrs Marland	
Trucking industry	2174
Mr Mancini	
Mr Philip	
Mr Arnott	
Violence against women	2175
Mr B. Ward	
Ms Swarbrick	
Trucking industry	2176
Mr Kwinter	
Mr Pilkey	
Ontario Science Centre	2176
Mrs Marland	
Mr Marchese	
Automobile insurance	2177
Mr Chiarelli	
Mr Kormos	

Throne speech debate

Resuming the adjourned debate	2177
Mr Harris	2177
Mr B. Ward	2183
Mr Henderson	2184
Mr Carr	2185
Mr Sutherland	2186
Mr Chiarelli	2188
Mr Curling	2188
Adjourned	2190

Other business

Fire prevention	2165
The Speaker	
Food containers	2165
The Speaker	
Notice of dissatisfaction	2177
Mr Mancini	
Adjournment	2190

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	2191
---	------



60 1990

60 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 27 November 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 27 novembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 27 November 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

ANNUAL REPORT, OFFICE OF THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I am today laying upon the table the annual report of the Provincial Auditor of Ontario, covering audits completed through 31 August 1990.

CLOSED-CAPTIONING

The Speaker: I am also pleased to inform members that all televised House proceedings are now being closed-captioned. Closed-captioning is a technique whereby a typed transcript of the spoken debates appears simultaneously with the televised pictures. This service is invaluable to the hearing-impaired, people learning to read and speak English, and of course your friends in the press gallery, who note your every word. Members should be very proud that their House is the first Legislature in the world to provide this service.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs Fawcett: As our critic for women's issues, I wish to comment as we close the month designated as Wife Assault Prevention Month.

Our party has always worked towards the goal of the social, legal and economic equality and wellbeing of women. It is our belief that a woman cannot function equally if she cannot function freely in a safe and secure environment.

The Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues gave a laudable statement at the beginning of this month, but the climate changed to a depressing cold yesterday when she answered her own colleague's question. What a perfect chance she missed to give some hope and courage to abused women.

But did she tell them that they do not have to stay in abusive situations? No. Did she tell them that they and their children can have safe shelter in a transition house? No. Did she say that there are training programs to help them to self-sufficiency? No. Or that there are counsellors to listen and advise? No. Or did she say that there are more shelters coming on stream? No.

What did she say? She told them that one half of the New Democratic Party cabinet equals 11 women. When women suffering from violence needed hope and encouragement to break the silence for themselves and for their children, all they got was a lesson in fractions. Frankly, I do not think they give a darn about fractions. They want and need help and it is our duty to ensure that

everyone knows there is no place for violence against women in our society.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS PERIOD

Mr Eves: When the standing orders were amended in 1986 and again in 1989, we designated a period of each day during routine proceedings for private members' statements. Leaders of each party and cabinet ministers were explicitly excluded from this period to ensure that private members were given their opportunity to make statements.

The government has at its disposal a designated time during routine proceedings to make ministerial statements, announcing government initiatives, legislation, policies and other proclamations. This time is made available to the opposition parties immediately after ministerial statements for them to respond.

We feel that private members' statements should not be used to announce any government initiatives. When the standing orders were drafted, the intent of all parties and all members was clear. Private members' statements are for individual members. Ministerial statements are for government announcements and initiatives.

Therefore, to ensure that the original intentions of the standing orders are maintained, today I will be tabling a motion to amend the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly to prohibit the announcement of any government initiative, legislation, policy or proclamation during private members' statements. That is the spirit in which all members of the Legislature drafted the change in rules and we will see that those changes are put into practice.

FAMILY VIOLENCE

Mrs MacKinnon: Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of the House.

In conjunction with Family Violence Month, I have the privilege of announcing that on 20 November 1990 the Walpole Island first nation band established a family violence community awareness program.

The residents of Walpole Island and the Wallaceburg community are to be commended for identifying this problem and for their hard work and dedication to making this vital service a reality.

This type of support will help to assist in reducing the incidence of family violence. Native women and children are just as vulnerable as are their urban counterparts.

This funding will provide information and referral services to individuals and families. It will be in contact with other agencies in Chatham and Sarnia to share information about family violence and services available to the people involved in situations of abuse.

The funding will also be used to cover costs associated with awareness and education through public forums led by professionals in the area of family violence.

I would be remiss if I did not applaud the Minister of Community and Social Services for ensuring that the funding in the amount of \$41,800 for this vital work is in place to stop the hurting and break the silence.

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr Curling: In listening to the throne speech and statements by the ministers of the government, it is clear the NDP is neglecting the needs and aspirations of the disabled, native people and visible minorities.

The Attorney General says he wants to increase the number of women judges. That is an honourable goal, and I support his efforts, but he completely ignores the disabled, native people and visible minorities. He says he will go outside the province to hire qualified women. As well as seeking qualified women, he should seek qualified candidates right here in Ontario from among the disabled, native people and visible minorities. What is he waiting for?

The throne speech committed the government to expanded pay equity and employment equity programs. All we are getting is promises. What we need is action.

Last May, the Premier introduced a private member's bill on employment equity, saying, "This bill is the result of a long period of discussion and consultation." If the Premier was satisfied with the consultation he conducted last spring, he should reintroduce the legislation as a government bill and put it before a committee of this House. What is he waiting for?

The government is also dragging its heels on proclaiming the sections of the Police Act which cover employment equity. The legislation introduced by the Liberal government has been debated, passed by this House and given royal assent. The government should move ahead on this issue. What is the government waiting for?

When it comes to standing up for the rights of the disabled, native people and visible minorities, this government has been invisible.

1340

LANDFILL SITE

Mr J. Wilson: My statement is directed to the Minister of the Environment. I would like the minister to rethink a decision she made recently regarding the Wasaga Beach dump. On 31 October of this year, the Minister of the Environment granted an emergency certificate on behalf of Simcoe county, which enables six north Simcoe municipalities to truck their garbage to the Wasaga Beach dump.

In her efforts to arrive at a politically expedient solution, the minister is playing brinkmanship with the environment.

This House should be aware that, first, the dump is situated on top of the Alliston aquifer and, second, recent studies indicate that the Wasaga dump is leaching. In addition, just hours before the minister granted an emergency certificate, the dump was enlarged by 30% on land that has never previously been used for landfill.

The minister obviously needs to be reminded that Wasaga's economic lifeblood flows from its tourist traffic. The creation and perception of a superdump within Wasaga Beach is tantamount to flirting with economic disaster.

Perhaps the minister would be wise to listen to officials at the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, who are aware that the Wasaga dump is nestled along the edge of the world's largest freshwater beach and who disagree with the minister's decision.

Studying the problem after the fact is unacceptable and environmentally unsound. In *An Agenda for People*, the minister's party promised to safeguard the environment. I am asking the minister today to live up to that promise and revoke the emergency certificate. The garbage will not disappear, so start dealing with it in a responsible fashion.

CLARENCE WILLIAMS

Mr Lessard: I rise today to pay tribute to a long-standing resident of the city of Windsor who celebrated his 79th birthday last Thursday. Clarence Williams, despite his age, has been described by the Windsor Star as a "wiry, bespectacled dynamo."

Clarence has spent his entire life fighting for the cause of democratic socialism. He was a founding member of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and has been described by some as "Tommy Douglas" because of his roots in Saskatchewan and his slight resemblance to the late legend.

He has been married to his wife, Esther, for 58 years, and has been a resident of the city of Windsor for almost 50 of those years. He has lived his life with the belief that everybody should be able to share the wealth a little bit better. He has been a union member, an unsuccessful political candidate and a persistent pest to former Liberal and Conservative governments.

Clarence is best known for his regular letters to the editor and his caustic and critical political protest banners. But it is at election time when this great-grandfather really gets his political activism into high gear.

Clarence is just one of the many unsung heroes whose dogged determination and belief that one person can make a difference led to the historic events on 6 September. It is a pleasure to pay him tribute today, and I hope, Clarence, that you can take it easy, at least for five years, on the provincial government.

TRANSIT SERVICES

Mr Mancini: Yesterday's announcement by the Minister of Transportation concerning the extension of commuter services represents nothing less than a sellout of the people of Brantford and Peterborough, and is another broken NDP promise.

The NDP commitment could not have been more clear. In response to a question about the extension of GO rail service in a Toronto Star survey published 25 August, the Premier put it in writing, penned by his own hand: "I am

pleased to extend GO Transit services to Peterborough and Brantford."

This is what the NDP promised; it is not what the residents of Peterborough and Brantford got. Instead of full rail service, Peterborough citizens will have to make do with bus service to GO stations, not in Peterborough but out in Oshawa. Instead of full GO rail service, the people of Brantford must make do with once-a-day Via trains, costing taxpayers \$200,000, and costing Brantford commuters a whopping \$640 a month.

Furthermore, these decisions were imposed by the NDP government without any meaningful consultation with the affected communities.

This morning I spoke with the mayor of Brantford, who informed me that the council has passed a resolution which states that it is not happy with the NDP actions and wants to hear from this government.

ONTARIO SCIENCE CENTRE

Mr Harnick: Yesterday the member for Mississauga South asked the Minister of Culture and Communications to provide the members of this House with the details of the ongoing investigation at the Ontario Science Centre. The minister replied that yes, indeed, as the Premier had said, the matter was under investigation by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and that because of a pending lawsuit he was not able to answer any questions about the matter.

The member for Mississauga South merely asked the minister what was being investigated, as the individual who signed the original contract had already been fired, and requested that the minister table a copy of the original contract signed between the science centre and the government of Oman as well as the legal correspondence surrounding it. The minister hid behind a vague interpretation of the law and avoided answering.

I would like to presume that the minister has better legal advice than the science centre apparently did, but this does not seem to be so. The documents requested by the member for Mississauga South all precede any eventual legal action which might be taken against this government. As such, release of these documents would not be prejudicial to any such legal action.

Would but this were a question rather than a statement, I would ask the minister again, as well as the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, what are they investigating? I would presume that before the director general of the science centre was fired the issue was properly investigated. If the government is just now investigating this matter, it begs the question of what it is trying to hide and whose agenda it is responding to.

Finally, the minister yesterday offered the Premier an opportunity to answer the question of what the government is investigating. With great surprise to me and the members of my caucus, the Premier declined to answer. Shame, I say to the Premier.

VISITOR

Mr Bisson: It is my pleasure today to introduce someone who is no stranger, who sat in this House from 1967 to 1977, the honourable Reverend Bill Ferrier. I would like to draw the attention of the House over to the side to give him a round of applause.

It is appropriate that on the first occasion in this House that I get up to speak I have the opportunity to mention not only the work that other past members have done but this chance we have the opportunity to have Bill in the House himself. For your good service for the 10 years from 1967 to 1977, thank you very much, Bill, and may I live up to the record you had while you were in the House.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

EDUCATION OF HEARING-IMPAIRED

Hon Mrs Boyd: You may have noticed, Mr Speaker, that the interpreter is pointing towards the gallery. We have a number of interested observers this afternoon and the interpreter has agreed to interpret for them as well.

I would like to inform members today of four important measures concerning the education of deaf and hard-of-hearing students. These measures will help make the education offered to deaf and hard-of-hearing students a more open and supportive education, one that responds to their needs as individuals and as participants in the community.

As one step towards this goal, a wider choice of communications options will be made available.

I am pleased to announce that the Ontario government is committed to recognizing American sign language and la langue des signes québécois as languages of instruction.

Within the next four years, these rich and expressive languages will be established as optional languages for learning in Ontario schools and programs.

My ministry will work with organizations and individuals interested in deaf education to achieve this goal. At the same time, we will ensure that other communications methods continue to serve the needs of deaf and hard-of-hearing students, whether they come from an English- or French-language background.

1350

I want to thank my colleague the member for York East for his untiring efforts to increase the choice available to deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

The government also intends to broaden its criteria for funding "in lieu" programs. These are the programs offered by school boards for deaf students who are eligible to attend provincial schools but are enrolled in regular schools. Under the new criteria, grants will be available to assist boards with the cost of providing interpreters and specialist teachers to teach students for a portion of the school day.

The government believes that consultation on these and other issues is essential for the continuing improvement of deaf education. I am therefore announcing the

establishment, in the new year, of two minister's advisory committees on deaf education, one anglophone and one francophone. The anglophone committee will be chaired by the member for Sault Ste Marie, my parliamentary assistant. The francophone committee will be chaired by the member for Cochrane South. These committees will include representatives from the deaf and hard-of-hearing communities. There will also be representatives of parents, school boards, the provincial schools and interpreters.

The committees will advise me on a range of issues dealing with deaf education that were identified in the ministry's reviews of programs and services for deaf and hard-of-hearing students which was conducted under the last government. One of these issues will be the implementation of ASL and LSQ as languages of instruction.

Finally, the Minister of Colleges and Universities and I are pleased to announce that responsibility for training teachers of deaf and hard-of-hearing students currently undertaken at the provincial school in Belleville will be transferred to the faculty of education at York University. This transfer will take place on 1 July 1991. York University was selected through a competitive process that involved extensive consultation with individuals and organizations interested in deaf education.

York's program will help to meet the continuing need for qualified specialist teachers of deaf and hard-of-hearing students throughout Ontario regardless of communication method used. Teachers in this special field of education will benefit from training at a major university with its diverse resources and expertise. I am especially pleased that York University's program will include a strong commitment to affirmative action to increase the number of teachers who are deaf and hard of hearing. In the 1991-92 fiscal year, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities will provide \$497,000 in funding for this program.

All of these measures reflect the government's commitment to providing Ontario's deaf and hard-of-hearing students with opportunities to participate more fully in our learning society.

I want the House to know that the interpreter will continue to interpret everyone's statements in the House as long as our special guests are here with us today.

ABORTION

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I would like to make an announcement on abortion services on behalf of this government. As Minister of Health, I am acting as spokesperson because this is consistent with our belief in the principle that abortion is a health issue, not a criminal matter. Federal Bill C-43 threatens this principle. It leaves women seeking abortions, and physicians who perform them vulnerable to criminal prosecution. This is unacceptable. It is unacceptable because it violates the basic right of women to control their bodies.

Even though this bill has not yet passed through the legislative process, we are already feeling its effects. Surveys indicate that up to 50% of physicians who currently

perform abortions will stop if the bill becomes law. Already the communities of Sault Ste Marie and Brantford have lost their abortion services. Many communities in Ontario have never had them.

Let me assure the members of one thing: This government will continue to fight the passage of Bill C-43. My colleague the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues and I will soon be appearing before a Senate committee to tell it why the bill must not be passed.

We are equally determined to make sure that women have access to safe, legal abortions in this province. As Minister of Health, I would like to announce the following preliminary measures.

Our first priority will be to speed up licensing of freestanding abortion clinics under the Independent Health Facilities Act. Although the Ministry of Health now covers a fixed amount for services at these clinics, women can pay from \$200 to \$1,000 in additional fees. Once they are licensed, these clinics will be funded entirely by the Ministry of Health. Women will no longer pay any fees. This will remove the financial barrier for women seeking abortions at these clinics.

Next, I would like to announce a change to the northern health travel grant program. This program currently covers travel expenses for people in northern communities who must travel to see specialists. The grants will be extended to cover women from these communities who seek abortions from general practitioners at freestanding clinics. Again, this will help remove financial barriers for women who live in northern communities where abortion services may not be available.

This government is also consulting with women's groups, provider groups and community groups to find new ways of improving access.

Our next priority will be to actively recruit and train physicians to provide abortion services. There are a number of options open to us, options that will, we hope, provide solutions to the problem of access.

I would like to make one final point: I speak on behalf of this government when I say that while we strongly respect the fundamental freedoms of the people of Ontario, illegal conduct which infringes or interferes with the decision to undergo an abortion is contrary to public policy.

In closing, I would like to re-emphasize that the measures I have announced are only the first steps towards our goal. That goal is to help overcome some of the economic and social barriers women face, a goal which will see more educational programs aimed at prevention of unwanted pregnancy and access to safe, legal abortions for all women who need them in this province.

RESPONSES

ABORTION

Mr Phillips: I would like to respond to the Minister of Health, first indicating the areas we are in support of in

terms of her statement, and then raising a couple of areas we have some concerns about.

First, of course, we support access to safe and legal abortions. We are very much supportive of ensuring that it is sensitive and timely, that it is safe and secure for the women who are affected and that it offers support to those women.

I think our concern about the minister's statement would be with the focus she has put on the freestanding abortion clinics. Our party would have strongly preferred to have seen her take a more holistic approach to it. Certainly that was the approach we took, of looking at more than just abortion services: Looking at counselling, looking at family planning, looking at pregnancy testing, looking at fertility help, support for single expectant mothers and looking at counselling on alternatives. If there is a major area of concern we have with the minister's statement, it is the singleminded focus in this statement dealing with the freestanding abortion clinics.

A secondary concern, perhaps not as significant but none the less very important to us, is the matter I raised last week here in the House, that is, health services generally in the north. We are pleased to see that the grants for this program will be available, but we were very much looking forward to a more comprehensive statement on health care in the north.

So a portion of this statement we can support and a portion, as members can see, we have some concerns about. We would hope that as the minister goes forward she takes into consideration what we think is a more fundamental approach to this and takes a broader look at abortion rather than just looking at freestanding abortion clinics.

1400

EDUCATION OF HEARING-IMPAIRED

ÉDUCATION DES ÉLÈVES SOURDS ET MALENTENDANTS

Mr Beer: It is a pleasure to rise and commend the minister on the statement which has been made today with respect to deaf education. I would like to share with her our congratulations to our colleague the member for York East and all the work he has done. I think it is only fair to mention as well the work which the former member for Scarborough West did on this whole issue.

Our party is pleased with this statement, because when I go back and look at the statement to the Legislature of approximately a year ago, it seems to me that the system we have followed has ensured that we have met all the various points that were raised at that time by the former Minister of Education and that the key element here is that we are seeking to ensure full access for those who are hearing-impaired.

In order to do that, we want to maintain the range of options, but I think we have to recognize the cultural aspects of this whole issue, and therefore the recognition of both American sign language and langue des signes québécois as languages of instruction is clearly very important. We believe that if this goes forward it is going to

provide the kind of options to students, to parents, to all of those who are involved in this area, and not make anyone feel they must follow a particular route but that indeed there is choice.

J'aimerais dire aussi que j'appuie fortement les étapes que le Ministère va entreprendre pour la communauté francophone. Des fois, c'est la communauté francophone qui ne peut pas, en effet, utiliser les programmes parce qu'on a oublié, dès le départ, qu'il faut aussi établir les programmes en langue française.

In closing, I also think the decision to place the training of teachers at York University is an excellent one. Again, discussions have been under way for some time, but this will mean that those who will be teaching in our schools, those who will be working with those who are hearing impaired, will have access to one of the finest universities in the country, particularly in this area.

Again, I believe there were many things the former government was taking over the course of the last few years to improve access for many who in one way or another had a handicap or were disabled. I think this is a continuation of that and frankly is an area in which all the members of this House join. So, again, congratulations.

ABORTION

Mr Eves: I am pleased to rise and reply on behalf of our caucus with respect to the statement made this afternoon by the Minister of Health. I think we all agree on the principle of equal access province-wide, regardless of where you live in the province, to women's health centres.

While I appreciate the minister's position and her government's position with respect to Bill C-43, I would suggest to the minister on behalf of her government that it would be more prudent and make more sense to wait and see what the end result of Bill C-43 in fact is going to be. As a matter of fact, she might want to confer with her colleague who is sitting almost directly behind her, the Attorney General, and see what his approach and response is going to be to Bill C-43, if and when it is passed and in what form it is passed and what the real consequences of that legislation are before she embarks upon spending taxpayers' dollars perhaps only a few months down the road to find out that she embarked down the wrong road and perhaps is going to have to change her position somewhat.

It is fine for the minister to sit there and shake her head "no," but if Bill C-43 is passed in its current form, and whether she agrees with it or not, the reality is that it will be the law in this country and will have to be adhered to not only by Ontario, but every individual in this country as well and every province as well.

Mr Harnick: To protect doctors from unwarranted prosecution and harassment, the government should require the consent of the Attorney General to the laying of any charges. In this way we could avoid the expense of setting up freestanding clinics and use our hospitals to the best extent possible.

EDUCATION OF HEARING-IMPAIRED

Mrs Cunningham: It gives me pleasure to rise in the House on behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus to compliment the Minister of Education on the statement made in support of deaf education and hard-of-hearing students in Ontario.

At the same time, I would like to take the opportunity to commend the former Liberal government for the work it did. In their announcement of 13 June, I think they made a good beginning to looking at a wider choice of communication objectives for the province.

Also, we would like to underline that we welcome the recognition of LSQ as well as ASL as a language of opportunity for hard-of-hearing students. I would also like to say that we are happy to see a four-year time frame so that programs can be implemented carefully and with consultation with school boards and parents across the province.

We commend, and we think we have said this before, the speech and the example set by the member for York East in this Legislative Assembly and we would like to complement him with his ongoing challenges and support him whenever possible.

We will take this opportunity to underline that one of the great criticisms of the former Liberal government was that when it did think up new programs we think were appropriate and necessary, it did not match the funding and the grants to go along with them. Although everyone is interested in improved programs for all of our special students, we will underline that this time we see grants available to assist boards to go along with the programs, and we compliment the minister for that.

Also, regarding the grants to go along with assisting York University as it does its training, as mentioned in this release, it is extremely important that the public know where the money is coming from when programs are defined here in this Legislative Assembly and in the ministers' offices.

We would advise the minister, as she continues with her work, that with her advisory committees on deaf education, the francophone and the anglophone, whenever she needs our assistance on this side of the House we would be most happy to be helpful. We wish her luck in this four-year plan and commend her for her initiatives.

ORAL QUESTIONS

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the leader of the government on agriculture policy. As the program put forward by the New Democratic Party before the election indicated specific action by way of long-term financing and interest rate relief for farmers and the speech from the throne does not follow up on that but in fact establishes a special fact-finding group of NDP members only to approach the farm community, would the Premier explain why the speech was devoid of any response to the election promises made and why he would select only a group of NDP supporters for this review in the farm community rather than engaging the standing committee on resources

development, which would involve representation of all parties in this important process.

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, if the resources committee decides it wants to look at that question as well, that is perfectly fine. We have nothing against that. I think that would be a good suggestion. We have, as many others have in the past, asked a group of caucus members to help inform the government on the question of farm finance. I think that is a good idea. If there are suggestions coming from other parties that want to go through the resources committee, that is fine as well.

I think the Leader of the Opposition will also appreciate that for the most part we are waiting until the budget before making detailed financial statements. There are some things we are able to do right away; there are other things that are going to take a little more time. I think people understand that.

When I spoke to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture yesterday morning, my sense was of reaching out to it for a partnership, of saying that the government is very sensitive to the problems facing farmers today. It is an issue that is going to be informing the Minister of Agriculture and Food when he goes to Brussels at the end of the week with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, because we think that the fate of supply management and of other issues is very critical and that it is important for Ontario to be strong in that regard.

All I can say is that the question of farm finance, interest rates and farm incomes is very close to this government. However, in terms of detailed proposals, we want to wait until the budget, because we think that is appropriate.

1410

Mr Nixon: I think the honourable Premier would be aware that by the time the Treasurer is dealing with his budget statement in the House, the farmers will be cultivating the soil and making their crop plans, if not actually undertaking the seeding.

I want to make it clear, Mr Speaker—it is something that you would understand—that in fact the process is not going to wait for the special group of NDP to consult with the farmers, particularly when so many of them voted NDP, to my regret. But their judgement was clear and it was on the basis of a promise for subsidized interest rates.

Now the honourable Premier indicates that this cannot be done until the time of the budget. Is he not aware that it can be done simply by the Treasurer or the Minister of Agriculture and Food making an appropriate announcement in this regard so that the farmers will have this assistance which the Premier promised in time for the next crop year?

Hon Mr Rae: I say to the Leader of the Opposition, my sense from talking to farmers and my sense from the meeting that I had yesterday with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture was that, quite opposed to their being opposed to our consultation, they were very enthusiastic about it because the design of programs and how they work is something that we want to discuss with people

before they are done. I think that is a reasonable approach. I certainly think it has wide support within the farm community, and in fact our sense from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture was that it very much saw the setting up of the committee on farm finance as being a very important step in consultation and in living up to the commitments which we made to the people of the province in the last election campaign.

Mr Cleary: My question is to the Premier too. The previous government increased funding to agriculture by 65% between the years 1984 and 1990 and introduced over 100 new programs to address the need of Ontario farmers. Most recently, in the spring, the previous government introduced the farm income assistance program providing interest relief and protecting farmers from weak commodity prices. The program was introduced only after extensive consultations with the farm community. Could the Premier explain to the House why he is making Ontario farmers wait for his government to formulate a new plan, when extensive consultation has already been conducted? I would like to stress that Ontario farmers cannot wait until spring.

Hon Mr Rae: Again, I appreciate the question from the member for Cornwall and I appreciate his expertise and look forward to his advice, as do many other members who have far more expertise in this area than I do. I look forward to hearing from them.

Let me say to the member that unless I am very wrong—and I could be; Lord knows it has happened before—my sense from the members of the farm community is that they appreciate the fact that the government, through its caucus, is consulting widely, is talking with people before we simply announce a program. I think that is the best way for us to proceed. I think it is wise, I think it is prudent and I think it is a way of dealing with problems that is appreciated by the people of the province. At least, I certainly hope so.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mrs Sullivan: My question is for the Minister of the Environment. In the Oshawa Times of 8 August 1990, there was a report quoting the Premier as saying in Pickering and then in Newcastle: "All expansions of existing dumps and new sites must go through full hearings under the Environmental Assessment Act." The paper noted that this statement brought applause from people in Whitevale.

The paper also reported that the Premier said the best way to reduce the province's dependency on landfill was to reduce the number of Liberals in the Legislature. I do not know why I raise that, but earlier, in this House, the Minister of the Environment, when she was Environment critic, asked a question of the then minister in this Legislature, on 4 December 1989, saying: "Can the minister explain why now, 15 years later, as we enter the last decade of the century, he is leading us backwards, away from the Environmental Assessment Act, and putting landfill approvals under the Environmental Protection

Act? Is that the kind of government we are to expect in the future from this minister?"

My question is, will the Minister of the Environment answer her own question and will she place all of the new interim landfills or expansions under a full environmental assessment?

Hon Mrs Grier: Let me make it very clear to the member that it is not our intention to have an interim landfill site for the greater Toronto area. The announcement that I made in the House last week indicated that whereas the previous government had fast-tracked the approval process to reach an interim site, it is our intention to fast-track the reduction side of the equation. We are going to drive very hard to make sure, in partnership with the municipalities, that we reduce, reuse and recycle and do not need an interim site for the greater Toronto area.

Mr McClelland: The Minister of the Environment said a week ago that she was going to eliminate the need for an environmental assessment, or the exemption was being pulled for site 6 in Brampton. Site 6B happens to be in my riding. She said she was going to do that in favour of a full environmental assessment and set up her waste management program. Next day, she stated that she expects that waste management and recycling and reduction, as she indicated today, will solve all that problem, but if she has to, she will eliminate any environmental protection type of process, either environmental assessment or an Environmental Protection Act hearing, and use her emergency power and authority to use site 6B in Brampton and other interim sites.

Peel region garbage goes to Britannia. It will be full by the end of December 1991. When are we going to see the promised benefits from the minister's proposed plan in the form of a substantive reduction in waste volume? And this wonderful plan that she is talking about here today, we want to hear more about it.

We understand from her ministry that a draft regulation on the work plan will arrive within a month or two. Then we go into public consultation well into the spring; then maybe, who knows when, a final regulation. It is my understanding that once that stage is reached, some time well into the spring or beyond the summer, it goes to the private sector for six to nine months—based on information from her ministry in terms of her plan—on top of that, after next spring or next summer. Then we begin to deal with it.

Would the minister not agree that in the best-case scenario, we are going to be well beyond one year? If we are not, when can she tell us we are going to see the first benefit from her waste management authority?

Hon Mrs Grier: I hope that we will begin to see the benefit of this government's commitment to waste reduction immediately, because many of the programs that would allow municipalities to reduce their garbage are in place. For example, under the procedures implemented by the previous government, the regional municipality of Halton is currently diverting 23% of its waste from

landfill, whereas the regional municipality of Peel, in 1990, is diverting merely 12%. I hope that I will have the full co-operation of the member for Brampton North within his own municipality in pushing it very hard to get to reduction starting today, if not last Wednesday when I made my announcement.

Mr Curling: The people in my riding, Scarborough North, are extremely confused. They are up in arms about the minister's promise to use emergency powers to open interim landfills without full environmental assessment, as she said, if the plan does not work or reduce. One of those interim sites, of course, is the proposal for the Rouge Valley, M2. Can the minister assure this House today that the Rouge Valley will not be site for one of her EA-exempted emergency sites? Will she release specific details of her waste reduction scheme to the people of Ontario? This is a cornerstone of her statements of the last week. We can only presume that a complete and detailed action plan exists. Where is it?

1420

Hon Mrs Grier: Let me say to the member that a complete and detailed action plan for waste reduction will be available and will be announced much more quickly than the previous speaker indicated with his time line of a year.

I would hope that in addition to the programs which are currently in place, and which I hope all municipalities across the province will begin to take advantage of immediately, there will be additional indications in consultation with the municipalities with which I have been discussing the kind of regulations and assistance they will require. I hope within the next couple of months to be able to lay out the kind of action plan that the member is seeking and I hope his municipality will be fully co-operating in the partnership that will be established to implement that plan.

PROTECTION OF IN-CARE RESIDENTS

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Premier. On page 96 of the auditor's report released today, we learn that 15 residents at one of the agencies for the developmentally handicapped had died between January 1988 and December 1989. The report indicates that the mortality rate in this facility was three times higher than in other agencies and that it represented 15% of the agency's residents. Because the Provincial Auditor has refrained from naming this institution—that is a role, he pointed out today, that belongs to the Legislature, the minister, the Premier and the government—will the Premier now inform this House and the people of the province of the name of this facility?

Hon Mr Rae: I want to make sure I have got the name correct and I am frankly trying to find the exact note. I am familiar, obviously, with the auditor's report and I will get the answer directly to the leader of the third party as soon as I have it, but the information that is contained in the auditor's report, is of great concern to me and to this government. As soon as I was informed with respect to what I would regard as the breakdown in appropriate enforcement

with respect to nursing homes, I was very concerned about it. I can assure the member that steps were already taken under the previous administration to deal directly with problems of nutrition and appropriate care in this facility.

I think that all members of the House would share a profound concern on my part, which I certainly have, and I have been up on my feet long enough to be able to tell the member, and I have no hesitation in revealing the information to the leader, as I am sure he would appreciate, it is the Brantwood Residential Development Centre in Brantford.

Mr Harris: I wonder if the Premier can tell us, since he is familiar with this situation, why it took the Provincial Auditor to uncover this situation; why there is no inspection of adult facilities or facilities where some 550 adults across this province live in some 10 agency-operated institutions; why there is no inspection by the ministry and it took the auditor to uncover this, fortunately or unfortunately, so that it came to light. I wonder if the Premier can tell me this: Why was the facility not named for the benefit of those members of families of the residents of this facility, both existing and future, at the time in January when it was reported to the ministry, and not made public but indeed covered up, and why did the Premier and his government not release this information as soon as he had it?

Hon Mr Rae: With respect to the last point, let me say to the leader that I am sharing all the information that I have. I thought it was appropriate to wait for the Provincial Auditor's report. There has certainly been no effort or instruction or anything of that kind on my part not to share information. Any information that I have, I will share.

Further information that I will share with the member is that the coroner's office was informed of the deaths that did occur over a two-year period within the population of 110 people at the centre, that a team review was struck and began its work in April 1990 and that as soon as the auditor's advice or review was with the government, to be fair—and I want to be fair to everybody—a review was undertaken to find out what was happening and to make sure that quality of care was improved. The board and staff of the centre have been fully co-operative in dealing with what I am sure the member will appreciate is a very difficult situation.

He says, "How is it allowed this way?" I will give him one answer, and that is that all the recommendations that have been made, not just for the last five years but, if I may say so, for the last 10 or 15 years with respect to advocacy, with respect to the need for independent review and inspection and advocacy on behalf of the most vulnerable citizens in this province, have been shelved by previous governments, which is why we said in our throne speech just a few short days ago that we were going to take those reports off the shelf and deal with the issue of advocacy on behalf of the most vulnerable citizens of the province, which is precisely what we are going to do.

Mr Harris: What the Premier is telling me is that it is bogged down in bureaucracy, has been and still will be. I would suggest to the Premier that yes, there have been

investigations ongoing, as we now find out thanks to the auditor. Why is it this House did not know that? Why did the public not know that? Perhaps if all this had not been covered up, we would have been moving a lot more quickly on it.

Yes, I appreciate that the Premier has been forthright in answering the questions once he is asked. I would ask him this: Why do we have to wait for the auditor's report for a question to be asked before this information is shared with this House and with the public of this province?

Second, the auditor points out that adult-only residences are not included in the ministry's inspection process. This presumably has been known since January. Can the Premier tell us if this has been the case as of last January, when it was made known to the former government, or is it now the case since it has become known to him?

Finally, the auditor suggests that a final report was to be completed by September of this year. Will the Premier tell us the status of that report? Was it completed on time? If so, where is it?

Hon Mr Rae: First, let me say to the leader of the third party that I am sharing the information I have. As soon as I am assured it is reliable information, I am making it as public as I possibly can, because I think the public has a right to know. I also think the public and parents and everyone have a right to the finest level of care that is possible within this province, whether it is in a home setting, whether it is in an institutional setting, whatever the setting may be. That is the standard this government requires. I can say to the leader that I am profoundly troubled by what has happened. I am sure I speak for all members of the House when I say that.

I believe that the notion of advocacy which we are presenting to the House is precisely a way of breaking through the kind of bureaucracy which he has talked about.

It seems to me that we have to have a system of independent advocacy and of independent inspection which ensures that there is constantly another way of breaking through where care is not being appropriately provided. I can also assure him that as soon as I have the detailed answers to his questions with respect to further reports and further information, I will provide them to him.

Mr Harris: If the Premier knows where it is, I would like to see it. If that report exists—I accept the word of the Premier that if it does, he will table it, and if it does not, he will give us an update on when it is going to be available.

1430

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr Harris: My second question is for the Premier as well. During the election the Premier made a promise to small business to introduce a program of reduced interest loans for startup costs and to refinance existing high interest loans at no cost to the taxpayer. That was his agenda.

Last week I asked the Premier, in view of the fact that he had backtracked on a number of commitments of his people's agenda and indicated that they were no longer possible as he had found out since assuming the reins of power, if he would share with this House what other election commitments he is now unwilling or unable to keep, and he asked me for specifics. He said he would prefer to respond to them one at a time individually.

Will the Premier specifically tell this House today if the promise that he made to small business during the election is a commitment that he is going to keep, and if so, when?

Hon Mr Rae: I think I also indicated in an answer to the Leader of the Opposition earlier on—and I know this will disappoint the leader of the third party, but I have to be very blunt with him—that we have made one major announcement with respect to the \$700-million investment that we are making in the future of the province, which we think will help small business, small contractors, a whole range of people.

With respect to the interest rate proposal, that is something which is still being studied and it is something which frankly we are not in a position to announce at this time.

Mr Harris: A spokesman for the Canadian Federation of Independent Business is quoted as saying, "A major tax epidemic in Ontario is literally helping American businesses put their neighbours out of business." Ontario really does have no equal when it comes to imposing taxes on business. They are leaving this province in great numbers to the east and the west and the south. They are taking with them thousands of jobs and, quite frankly, who can blame them?

During the election the Premier said he had a plan. He said the plan would be at no cost to the taxpayers, so I do not know what the big problem is—consulting with the Treasurer. We like the ones that are no cost to the taxpayer.

The Premier said specifically that he was going to introduce a program to reduce interest loans for startup costs and to refinance all the loans that they had at no cost to the taxpayer. Now he tells us he is studying it.

Could the Premier tell us if this was a goal that he had, not really a promise, and now he has found out it is not achievable or, if in fact in the campaign when he made this promise or he made this commitment, what has changed? What has changed between when he made this promise and today?

I can tell him that small business needs help more today than it did even back in August.

Hon Mr Rae: The leader of the third party asks—and he is not asking in a rhetorical way; I am sure he is asking in a very direct way—what has changed. I can only say to him that what has changed is that we have to set priorities with respect to what we can do in the first days and weeks of this government. That, it seems to me, is a perfectly legitimate thing to do.

I want to say to the leader of the third party that if we were to have introduced An Agenda for People on 1 October and said "regardless of the consequences, regardless of the economy, regardless of anything else," he would have been the first person, I believe, to stand up and say what an irresponsible thing that was to do.

I think that what we are doing is perfectly sound. We are saying to the people of the province that we are here to govern, not for two weeks or for two days, but for a term.

I have met with the small business community and the main thing the small business community has said to me is that it wants to consult. They do not want to go back to the days when there was an edict coming out of Queen's Park or an edict coming out of Ottawa with respect to the GST, where they were not consulted and not involved. They want to be involved.

That is what the Fair Tax Commission is designed to do and that is what our process of consultation is designed to do. That is what our budget consultation process is designed to do and that is exactly what we are going to do before we take action.

Mr Harris: I would suggest to the Premier that if he just carries on and waits until next spring, the consultation process will be a lot easier because there will not be very many of them left.

More than 300 businesses in Ontario declared bankruptcy last month alone. The small business people I have been talking to tell me they are concerned about the costs of raising the minimum wage; they are concerned about having to bear the total costs themselves of government-mandated programs such as employment and pay equity; they are concerned about what the employer health tax has done to their operating costs. They know that Ontario's present tax burden unquestionably contributes to this province's unacceptably high bankruptcy rate.

I do not know what there is to consult about or what the delay is on this one. The Premier said there is no cost to the taxpayer to bring in this program. If there is no cost to the taxpayer, why does he have to wait to put it on a priority list? Surely small businesses going bankrupt in record numbers, leaving the province in record numbers need help now. If it is at no cost, why does he not do it now?

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, the leader of the third party knows full well that there is no free lunch, and that statement has to be made. I think the people of Ontario understand that. I think the small business community understands that.

All I can say to the leader of the third party is that the economic situation is difficult right now; there is no question about it. There is no need, however, to be quite so gloomy and quite so pessimistic about what is going on in the province today.

We are going to work with all the elements of the community, in the face of very difficult circumstances—part of which are, if I may say so, the product of policies which come from another place, people he is far more

familiar with than I am—in trying to deal with the situation. It is in precisely that spirit that we intend to act.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr Offer: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. The minister will be aware that An Agenda for People promised that the minimum wage would be 60% of the average industrial wage over four years, and the recent throne speech somewhat reiterated that position by stating that the government will increase the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage over five years.

The average industrial wage in this province in March of this year was \$12.54, 60% of which is approximately \$7.20 per hour. However, if one assumes a modest 5% rate of inflation per year over the next five years, the AIW will be approximately \$15.23 per hour, 60% of which is \$9.14 per hour.

I believe this question to be important not only to the workers of this province but indeed to all employers and in fact potential investors. Is it the position of the minister's government for the minimum wage after five years to be 60% of the current AIW, \$7.20, or 60% of the projected AIW, \$9.14 per hour?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I am sure the member knows that we do not know for sure what inflation will be or what the value will be. But let me tell him very clearly that the position and policy of our government is that we will raise the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial average over five years.

Mr Offer: I am somewhat surprised by the answer, because there were very specific promises made in An Agenda for People, which stated, "Over four years we would increase the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage." And again in the throne speech it was stated, "Over its five-year mandate, my government will increase the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage."

I had some other questions in supplementary, based on a much more specific response by the Minister of Labour. The question to the minister is simply this: At the end of the five years, at the end of this particular promise which his government made, is the minimum wage for the workers of this province going to be 60% of the average industrial wage today, \$7.20, or 60% of the projected average industrial wage, \$9.14? What is the minister's position?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: To begin with, we do not know what the figures will be, as I said before. But is the member suggesting that we should only raise the minimum wage to what the current average is, which means we would be giving smaller increases than both his government and the Conservative governments gave over the last 10 years?

Mr Offer: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It would be very much appreciated if the minister is aware that I on this side will ask the questions and I would very much

appreciate if the minister would respond to the questions as opposed to posing questions.

1440

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

Mr Villeneuve: I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Could the minister tell this House why his government refuses to accept the Ontario Federation of Agriculture as the general farm organization in this province which is badly needed?

Hon Mr Buchanan: I am glad to answer that question. As the member well knows, there have been studies under way for several years by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, working towards bringing the farmers together. Farmers have been trying over the years to get their act together and get a common voice for farmers across this province.

To that end, committees had been working on proposals and trying to pull things together, but in recent months the different groups that were working on that, the National Farmers Union and the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario, have withdrawn at least partially or fully their support for the program being put forward by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture.

One of the principal elements that the OFA proposal suggests is stable funding for farmers, that farmers contribute to a farmers' organization. That is a very basic principle, and it is a principle that we endorsed last night and yesterday at the OFA banquet. We intend to pursue the concept of giving farmers a voice. We intend to listen to farmers and farm organizations in the future and consult with them, unlike some governments in the past.

Mr Villeneuve: Farmers do have their act together. An excellent presentation was put forth and it had input from the Christian Farmers and of course from the federation. The minister missed the boat yesterday because he told them that he was not ready to provide them with approval for stable funding. With the Christian Farmers and the NFU having less than one tenth the membership of the OFA, how in the world can the minister avoid naming the OFA as the general farm organization?

Hon Mr Buchanan: I have consulted across the province with various farmers and groups other than the federation of agriculture. I have talked to different commodity groups and I have talked to farmers individually, and the sense I was getting from my consultations is that we were not yet prepared to name just one organization for the province. There are still some groups out there that are not in agreement with the proposal that is there.

I am willing to look towards one farmer organization, and we intend to consult with the Christian Farmers and the NFU to see if we can pull it together. I am interested in having a strong voice for farmers and farm groups in this province. If we can pull it together, we will.

RETAIL STORE HOURS

Mr White: My question is for the Solicitor General. At present, hundreds of thousands of Ontarians work on

Sunday or are faced with the threat of Sunday work and have no common pause day for their families. When can the retailers and workers of Ontario expect to have new legislation in place to implement a common pause day?

Hon Mr Farnan: I have some good news and some bad news for the member. The good news is that we have a Premier who has very clearly publicly stated that he is committed to a common pause day. In addition to that, we have a government that is also committed to a common pause day, and indeed this concept was enshrined in the throne speech.

The bad news, of course, is that this issue is presently before the Ontario Court of Appeal. We have to wait for a decision from that court. We do not know when the decision will be handed down, but certainly we will look to that decision to help us to define the legislation that we will put into place and we will act swiftly to put that legislation into place at the appropriate time.

Mr White: Can we expect the government to put any actions in place pending either new legislation or the determination of the Supreme Court ruling?

Hon Mr Farnan: The reality of the matter is this: There is at the moment a situation where this issue is before the courts. As long as it is before the courts, we cannot take any action. When the decision is handed down, there will be language in that decision which will help us to define the kinds of legislation that we will bring forward. It is very clear that we will bring forward strong legislation, provincial legislation, that will enshrine a common pause day.

One thing I can say to the member and to all the members of this House is, I am going to try something novel. In the past, there has been a tendency on the part of the government to draw up the legislation and then consult. I shall be consulting and then drawing up the legislation.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Why do we not all try something novel, like listening to the member for Ottawa West, quietly?

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Chiarelli: My question is to the Minister of Financial Institutions. Yesterday the minister refused to provide the people of Ontario with any details as to the nature of the NDP's proposed auto insurance legislation. Will the minister alleviate at least some of the uncertainty which his government has created by giving us a direct answer to the question I am asking today?

Affordability of auto insurance premiums has always been a major goal of auto insurance reform. The previous government's Bill 68 provided average 0% increases outside the greater Toronto area and 8% within the greater Toronto area. The Premier now refuses to confirm his party's promise that state-run auto insurance will provide lower rates for the Ontario consumer. He is on record; the

quotes are there. Why will the minister not confirm that auto insurance rates will be decreased under his plan?

1450

Hon Mr Kormos: Let me tell members what is going to happen. The throne speech last week made it quite clear that legislation creating a public, driver-owned, non-profit auto insurance system is going to be presented to this assembly come spring of 1991.

In the interim, we are talking to people who have an interest in that legislation. This includes the victims who are not being compensated—the victims who are not being compensated because the last Liberal government took away from those innocent people the right to be compensated for pain and suffering. We are talking to the insurance companies that were quite pleased with the Liberal legislation, the same insurance companies which now want to have some stake in the public system that is going to be presented by way of legislation in the spring.

If the critic for the Liberal Party wants to talk to me about his proposals for public auto insurance, I would be pleased to have him engaged in that process as well.

Mr Chiarelli: If I could see under the desk of the minister, I am sure I would see that he has affixed a pair of skate blades to his cowboy boots, because he is doing a good job of skating around the issue. In opposition he was a great defender. Now that he is in government he is the great pretender. The people in Ontario want to know that his plan is going to lower automobile premiums, and he will not tell them.

In opposition the NDP was extremely clear about its position on auto insurance. Even in April 1987 his leader, now Premier, and his adviser, Mel Swart, said, and I quote, "We believe that accident victims should retain their right to sue where they think losses exceed benefit levels...nor do we consider it necessary to impose any kind of threshold requirement." The Premier now refuses to confirm that the NDP's auto insurance legislation will allow all accident victims access to the courts. He is on record, the quotes are there.

Will the minister today confirm his government's commitment to eliminate any threshold and to extend the right to sue to accident victims?

Hon Mr Kormos: People are watching this now, banging their foreheads and saying: "I don't believe this guy. How can he do this?" After he and his party spent so much time stripping away from innocent victims the right to be compensated, after the Liberals took away from victims the right to use the courts, after they poked their heads out of the back pockets of the insurance industry just long enough to ram their legislation through the Legislature, how dare he?

Interjections.

VISITOR

The Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the speeches on both sides of the House, but perhaps members would like to recognize a former long-standing member of this as-

sembly, Fred Young, who is seated in the members' gallery.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Runciman: My question is to my old friend—perhaps soon to be a former friend—the Minister of Financial Institutions. I want to take a different tack in respect to automobile insurance. We have now had the Liberal plan in effect for something like five months. We all know that the minister in his former role was very vocal indeed, as I was. His party took as strong a position in opposition to the no-fault plan as we did. He expressed great concern about innocent accident victims. He has reiterated that today here.

I would like to know why this minister has not acted. He has been in office for two months now and he has not done one single, solitary thing for innocent accident victims. When is he going to act?

Hon Mr Kormos: Give me a break. We have been talking to insurance companies, we have been talking to victims, we have been talking to friends of the member for Leeds-Grenville, because we appreciate the urgency with which this matter has to be responded to. The last government created a crisis here in the province of Ontario when it comes to availability of insurance and the types of benefits that were being denied innocent victims. We are working as promptly as we can to address that. That is why there is a timetable. That is why the throne speech indicated that legislation is going to be presented here in this assembly, legislation to create a public non-profit auto insurance system, one that is going to provide fair coverage, one that is going to ensure that victims are adequately compensated.

Once again, if the member for Leeds-Grenville has got opinions that he wants to express to me about public auto insurance, we are ready to listen.

Mr Runciman: This minister knows my views and my party's views on public auto insurance. I want to say that we are not talking about public auto insurance; we are talking about innocent accident victims. This member stood in this House for 17 hours and conducted a filibuster expressing concerns about innocent accident victims over and over, hour after hour.

I do not think it is too much to be standing in this House today and asking him why the devil does he not get off his duff and do something if he cares about them? Why does he not introduce some interim measures to address the concerns of those people? There are accident victims out there today; they were there yesterday; they are going to be there tomorrow, and he is not doing anything about it. He should get off his duff and do something.

Hon Mr Kormos: That is exactly why we are proceeding with such urgency to consult, to listen to people in communities across Ontario, to hear what their opinions are and to ensure that the legislation that we present here come spring is going to be the best possible solution to the insurance crisis that the last government

created and about which the Conservative Party has had no real solutions. That is why we are proceeding with such urgency. It is for those very reasons, and I appreciate the member raising that. We are going to respond; we are going to respond promptly.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr Martin: My question is for the Minister of Labour. Those of us who have worked in the trenches with people who are suffering for the last few years and now find ourselves in the halls of power are constantly miffed by the process of good New Democratic Party policy taken by the government of the day and misconstrued in its application.

We discovered through the recent difficult strike in our city that many folks, many women and children, who wanted to access help because they were in difficulty could not because of the social services legislation supported by the Liberal government. We were all excited by the fact that the strike was settled, only to find that now many of the workers who will not be called back to work cannot collect unemployment insurance because the federal Conservative government has legislation that speaks to their not being able to access that money.

What is the Ontario government able to do, if anything, in light of this injustice?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: The member raises a very serious question. The federal legislation requires that 85% of the workers be back at work before the rest can qualify for their UI benefits. That, unfortunately, is federal legislation. How much influence we will have with the federal Minister of Labour I am not sure, but we will be talking to him on this matter.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr Bradley: My question is to the Minister of Transportation. As the minister may be aware, employment levels at Port Weller Dry Docks in St Catharines, which is the largest shipbuilding facility in the province of Ontario, have fallen from some 800 down to approximately 60 at the present time. He will be aware as well that Port Weller Dry Docks has assembled a large number of individuals who are very capable of doing the job, who are skilled employees and who are willing to work.

In light of this and in light of the economic situation that faces the province at the present time, would the minister assure the House that he will proceed with the decision of the previous government to enter into an agreement with Canadian Shipbuilding and Engineering of St Catharines to have the much-needed Pelee Island ferry boat constructed at the Port Weller Dry Docks facility and thereby get willing and able employees back to work?

1500

Hon Mr Philip: I know of the former minister's concern for the unemployment rate in his area. I can tell him that no final decision had been made by the previous

government, that in fact there were three companies in the running for that particular contract, that I am reviewing these various contracts and the recommendations of my staff, that I have assured another member of his party that I would look at some other aspects of the problem, and that a decision will very soon be made and a recommendation will be going to Management Board in the next two to three weeks maximum. I would be pleased to share that decision with him as soon as that decision has been made.

Mr Bradley: I will not use the same supplementary I was going to. I appreciate the minister's evaluation of the project. The minister may be aware that the Port Weller facility operated by Canadian Shipbuilding and Engineering of St Catharines has a union there and that it is a unionized establishment that has very capable workers. He will recognize as well that the Canadian shipbuilding industry, at least in the province of Ontario, is probably what one might consider to be in dire straits and that in previous years governments at both the federal and provincial levels have consolidated operations at just a couple of places.

Is the minister prepared to report at the very earliest opportunity, because it is my understanding that it was simply a matter of crossing the t's and dotting the i's? I hope that is the case anyway. Would he give an assurance that in fact the Port Weller Dry Docks facility, which needs the work so badly, will be able to construct the much-needed Pelee Island ferry and get those people back to work? I know they would appreciate hearing from him at the very earliest opportunity before more of the extremely skilled people leave to go to other parts of the country or other parts of the world.

Hon Mr Philip: I can inform the former minister that our concern is twofold. One is to get value for money and get the best possible ferry for the people of Pelee Island at the best possible cost. In this regard, since some of the residents and particularly some of the farmers on that location have expressed some concerns, we have taken the initiative of having my parliamentary assistant, the member for Windsor-Sandwich, meet with these people this week to ensure that the product we are going to purchase will in fact be the best product to service their needs.

There are a number of needs for the people on that island. One is a reliable ferry service in terms of the tourist trade which my government and the previous government were interested in promoting in that area. The second is the service to the farmers and the movement of farm goods. We want to ensure that whatever option we take will service both of those needs, and I can assure the former minister that I am very anxious to proceed with this as quickly as possible for all of the reasons he has mentioned.

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr Eves: I have a question for the Minister of Health. As the Minister of Health is undoubtedly aware, the Ontario Hospital Association has requested additional

funding because of initiatives that the provincial government has imposed upon the hospitals, such as pay equity and the employer health tax.

In light of the fact that in the past year over 2,000 beds have been closed in Metropolitan Toronto alone, and according to the president of the OHA some 4,000 beds province-wide, with hundreds more likely to close between now and the end of the fiscal year, what are the minister's immediate plans to cope with this problem?

Hon Mrs Gigantes: In answer to the Conservative Health critic, I do not know what he is indicating is a problem. If he says that a bed closed is necessarily a problem, I am sure that is not what he means to imply. What we have been seeing over the last several months and in fact over the last couple of years is a willingness by the Ministry of Health and the hospitals of Ontario to sit down together, look at their financial problems together and work out adequate ways of financing the services that the hospitals need to be providing.

As the member is aware, special formulas have been developed so that each hospital that feels it is in financial difficulties can consult with the Ministry of Health, can in fact have taken into account in terms of its financial needs what kinds of equalization payments should be made to bring it up to the kind of level of funding that it requires. It is taken into account what the cases are in that particular hospital, the nature of the cases and what kinds of special life support programs a hospital may be running.

It is also the case that no hospital has closed beds in Ontario since last April without checking with the ministry to make sure that it was not affecting any specialized tertiary programs, emergency programs, critical care programs or schedule 1 mental health facilities. It has been a requirement since April that if hospitals ran into difficulties in providing those kinds of services, they would have to get approvals from the Ministry of Health. There have been no approvals sought or given.

I think we have to say that we are entering a new period of negotiations for new funding. There are still funding accounts to be met within the 1990-91 funding period. Each and every hospital will have its needs considered in that process.

Mr Eves: The minister is very well aware that there are approximately 80 hospitals in this province projecting deficits for this fiscal year, not next fiscal year, of some \$60.8 million. A large portion of those deficits is directly attributable to programs which the province of Ontario imposed on those public hospitals. Nobody is arguing about the merits of those programs. What we are talking about here, what we are asking the minister about, what her Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, asked the government of the day to do, is to fund those programs.

Will the minister now do for the public hospitals what her Premier asked the government of the day to do, and is she standing in this House saying that the fact that 4,000 hospital beds in this province have been closed, when she has people dying on waiting lists for cancer and cardiovascular surgery, to name two examples, is not a problem? Is that what I understood her to say, that the closing of 4,000

beds is not a problem? It is not a problem if you are not dying of cancer, I guess.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I do not know which of the member's questions to address myself to first. Let me ask the member if he is aware that within the 1990-91 funding year hospitals which still have deficits and which have presented to the ministry explanations of the services they are providing and the kinds of cases they are bearing and the kinds of specialty care that they provide—all these things will be taken into account as we are entering the period when those accounts will be finalized with the Ministry of Health.

Mr Eves: Does the minister think the closing of 4,000 beds in a year is appropriate? That was the question. Is the minister going to answer it or not?

Hon Mrs Gigantes: The member cannot seem to make up his mind what his question was. I have done my best to answer the question.

1510

NOTICES OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr Offer: Mr Speaker, I would like to give you notice that I am very dissatisfied with what I believe was a very specific question to the Minister of Labour on a very specific promise and I want to register my notice of dissatisfaction with his attempted response.

The Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 33, the member for Essex South has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Transportation concerning trailers on Ontario highways. This matter will be debated at 6 pm today.

Mr Chiarelli: Pursuant to standing order 33(a), I am not satisfied with the answers to my questions made by the Minister of Financial Institutions and I will raise the subject matter of the question on the adjournment of the House. I will provide written notice before 4 pm.

PETITIONS

ELEVATORS

Mr Harris: I have a petition signed by approximately 360 residents of North Bay and area which reads in part—as per your request to us the other day, Mr Speaker—as follows:

“To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

“We, the tenants of various senior citizen apartments, wish to express serious concern about the lack of qualified elevator technicians and elevator inspectors of North Bay, and probably the province. We are constantly faced with serious elevator breakdowns, which means elderly persons, with or without parcels, are sometimes required to walk up 11 flights of stairs. We believe something should be done before serious injuries happen.”

I too have signed this petition.

SANDWICH WEST WOODLOT

Mr Dadamo: I am presenting a petition today on behalf of 790 of my constituents, and I wish to add my name as well. The petition, in protest of the development of the Sandwich West woodlot, reads as follows, even though it is in the past:

"To all members of the Ontario Legislature:

"On Saturday 27 October 1990 youth and environmental groups across Canada will be responding to the Environmental Youth Alliance rally for the Earth Day. The Environmental Youth Alliance is against further development in forested areas and has appealed to Canadians to voice their opinions locally as part of World Rain Forest Week.

"In Essex county there is less than 2% forested land remaining and the situation here is absolutely unacceptable. The development of the Sandwich West woodlot would be a disaster. We believe that the province should prevent this tragic loss of natural habitat and we are asking that this area should be preserved for the future of Ontario."

POLICE SERVICES

Mrs Mathysen: I have a petition signed by 767 residents of the town of Parkhill to keep the Ontario Provincial Police in the town of Parkhill. I have signed my name to this petition.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ORATORY OF

SAINT PHILIP NERI-TORONTO ACT, 1990

Mr Mammoliti moved first reading of Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri-Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr Curling: Yesterday, in an address on the comments of the throne speech, I was talking about the multicultural society as expressed in the throne speech. As we know and hear very often from members of this House, Ontario is a diverse multicultural and also a multilingual society. Scarborough North, for instance, the riding I represent—I am very proud and honoured to know that it has returned me to this House to represent it—is a microcosm of what Ontario represents.

There are tremendous benefits for Ontario's having a multicultural society, but this society continues to show bigotry, continues to show increased racism, continues to show intolerance for visible minorities and we have seen, over the last few years, unrest between the police and the black community.

I applaud the previous government for moving on getting the Police Services Act addressed after it had been neglected for the last 40 years, without any amendments. As an elected member and the member for Scarborough North, I will be vigilant that these injustices and inequities are addressed. I will be actively monitoring the legislation and the actions of this government in making sure that not only lipservice is delivered. The Police Services Act must be proclaimed and the regulations drafted and, as was often said by the now government when it was in opposition, these regulations must have public input. I am extremely disappointed that, after months of being the government, it has not brought forward or indicated one aspect of when these regulations will be ready, but we stand prepared on this side of the House to have input and to get public input in the Police Services Act regulations when they come forward.

As I said earlier on, previously in this statement, the employment equity legislation is needed now—not tomorrow, not next year—employment equity legislation including not only women, who have been neglected for years, but all people who have been deprived of access and participation in society.

In closing, I would like to tell all members here that I am prepared to work very closely with them to make this province a better place, and in closing I would like to welcome all new members and returning members to the House. I look forward in the coming four years, unless the Premier decides to have a quick election, to working on the side of the government and the opposition to make this place a better place for our children and our elders and for myself to live in.

Mr Harris: I very briefly want to comment, since I know we want to get as many members as possible an opportunity to speak in the throne speech debate, on the member's remarks and suggest to him that I and my party share a number of the concerns that he has and has had, in a nonpartisan way. He had many partisan concerns when he was a minister we disagreed quite strongly with. He had a number of directions he wished to move in that we disagreed quite strongly with as well.

However, on the issue of multiculturalism and the very diverse nature of our province and the obligations on us to lead the way, to be sensitive to ways in which government can intervene and to ways in which government in fact causes problems when it intervenes if it intervenes in the wrong way, in making sure we have a responsive, pluralistic society where all can have the opportunity to achieve their potential, I believe that is what we are looking for.

Finally, the member indicated how pleased he was to be have been re-elected. Normally it is for others you like to comment on that. I do not believe the member was fishing, but since he alluded to it, I want to say that I congratulate him on his re-election. He beat our party and our candidate and all others fair and square, and I congratulate him on his re-election and return to the House.

1520

Mr Curling: Just a quick comment: the multicultural society needs no surrogate, and I am very proud of the members in the House here who at times, when they speak on behalf of the multicultural society, I feel speak earnestly and sincerely. I have worked with the honourable member who made those comments for the last five years, and I know his dedication and his interest, and that his heart is in the right place.

Mr B. Murdoch: I am delighted to be able to address this House today by replying to the speech from the throne. I would like to thank the people of Grey and Owen Sound who elected me to represent them and who have given me the privilege of participating in this debate.

I represent the riding of Grey. I follow in the footsteps of Eddie Sargent, who represented us in the Legislature for many years and who served his constituency well. I hope to be able to serve the people in Grey in the same caring manner.

Grey is a diverse riding, with Owen Sound as its largest urban centre. We also have the towns of Hanover, Durham, Meaford and Thornbury. There is a small manufacturing sector in the riding, but we would like to increase our tax base with the influx of clean industry.

Most of our riding's revenue, however, comes from tourism and agriculture, both of which were ignored in last week's speech from the throne. I know that the NDP power base in the past has not come from either of these two communities, but I say to the Premier and his cabinet that they cannot be overlooked. These two industries are vital to the wellbeing of much of the province, not just of my riding, and their needs must be addressed.

In Grey, our agriculture community consists mainly of dairy, beef, pork and sheep farmers. We also have a healthy apple industry which produces some of the finest fruit in Ontario.

Our tourist attractions are second to none. We have a four-season tourist area which attracts visitors all year to enjoy great skiing, beautiful walking trails, clean water and beaches and good fishing. I urge all members to see for themselves the fine recreational features my riding offers.

One of the loveliest areas in the province is the land in the Niagara Escarpment, and I feel very strongly that we should preserve its beauty for future generations. Its awesome beauty is there for all to admire and I trust nothing will change that.

There is, however, land in my riding which is marginal at best and my goal is to achieve a sensitive balance between conservation and development in these areas. This is difficult at present because my constituents cannot fully realize all the land has to offer, because of the lack of democracy shown by the Niagara Escarpment Commission. In my view, the commission has taken the decision-making away from the people who own the land, and this is not right. The land is theirs and they should have a say in its future.

Because the previous government offered few new initiatives to agriculture in the last five years, farmers have

been forced to sell off parcels of land to survive. Unfortunately, this government does not appear as yet to rectify the situation. Some say that Grey leads the province in severances, but I challenge these figures. Even if they are true, however, I do not feel it is important, because we do have the needed land for sustainable and affordable development.

The contour of the land and tree cover is such that many building lots could be created and never noticed. It would not change the natural environment at all and would provide prime locations for people who wish to live there.

The issue of local autonomy comes up again in the government's treatment of municipalities across the province. I have been a long-time observer of the relations between the two levels of government and an active participant in the process. As a past member of the executive of AMO, as a local reeve and county warden, and as my party's critic for Municipal Affairs, I would urge this government not to intrude further into the lives of its people.

Because of my experience, I understand the importance of our municipal governments in the effective functioning of our province. They want and deserve a co-operative and consultative relationship with the province, rather than a dependent controlling one, in order that they may be responsive to the people who elect them. This level of government is closer to the people and more respectful of them than any other.

I feel it is incumbent on this government to listen to what people have to say rather than to lobby groups that often do not even live in the community but think they know what is best for the people who do.

In the last five years, we in Ontario have lost the partnership that had been built between Queen's Park and our municipalities. I urge this government to ensure not only that the relationship does not deteriorate further, but to consult with local governments to determine what can be done to correct some of the problems.

I am hopeful that the \$700 million mentioned in the throne speech will be divided fairly across the province to assist in achieving that goal. So much needs to be done. The population of the province outside Toronto is growing quickly and smaller centres do not have, and cannot afford, the infrastructure to support this growth.

If the province is going to take the view that these centres must expand, then money is desperately needed. Water and sewer facilities must be expanded and highways must be upgraded. The roads in my riding are fast becoming very dangerous and I can only hope that this government will address the problem.

No mention was made of how or where this money will be spent. I hope, if it has not all been allocated as yet, that the minister and the Treasurer will try to understand the present plight of these small communities.

As members know, the previous government excelled in announcing initiatives which sounded wonderful, but upon examination came up with no funding to put them in place. This left the people of the province with high expectations and then greater disappointment when their

local governments could not afford to deliver without huge municipal tax increases. This also was not fair and I hope this new government will not continue to place these burdens on our local councils.

Some of the smaller urban centres in the province now have very fragile economies and cannot afford to lose what industry they have. I was disappointed to note that there was nothing in the throne speech to address this issue and I hope the government will give its attention to this matter as quickly as possible.

I am afraid that measures such as the proposed environmental bill of rights will indeed have the reverse effect and serve to drive industry away. I hope this is not the case, but I will examine the legislation closely and with the interests of smaller businesses in mind.

In closing, let me say once again how honoured I am to represent the voters of Grey and Owen Sound. I pledge to represent them to the best of my ability. I will be watching this government to ensure that my people's interests are addressed and I will work with them in order to meet Grey's and Owen Sound's goals and aspirations.

Ms Haeck: I have a question for the honourable member in relation to his comments on the Niagara Escarpment Commission. If I may point out at this point, the NEC was in fact a creature of a previous Progressive Conservative government and I am somewhat concerned that he does not recognize the important function of the Niagara Escarpment Commission.

I am wondering how he proposes to protect the natural beauty of a county like Grey—as I also have represented in the riding of St Catharines-Brock—and also the tourism that he mentions, and the clean water, without having a commission such as the Niagara Escarpment Commission to protect the interests of tourism, of the residents who live there and the natural beauty, all of which are part and parcel of the statement that he made.

The Niagara Escarpment Commission, I believe the honourable member for Grey will recognize, plays an important function. I wish him to comment on what he believes to be the true function of this commission.

1530

Mr McLean: I would just like to take a couple of minutes and compliment the member for Grey on the observations he made with regard to the riding and to the comments he made with regard to his past experience. I know he is going to be a great asset to this assembly and I want to compliment him on the contents of his remarks and wish him well in this assembly.

Mr B. Murdoch: I have a comment on what the honourable member mentioned across the floor. The Niagara Escarpment Commission is probably one of the most undemocratic commissions ever put in place in Ontario government. Unfortunately, it is there. What I had to say about it is that I think it should be disbanded. The people of Grey county and our area can look after our own resources and keep it beautiful as we have done for the past 100 years, so I do not think we need interference from someone else.

Mr Wood: Last week when I rose in the House, I neglected to congratulate the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker on their election to the chair. I want to do that today. I also want to congratulate all the other new members who were elected to the House as well as the older members who were re-elected.

I also want to thank the people of Cochrane North for giving me the opportunity to serve as their representative here. It is an honour for me to be able to participate in the legislative process. I can assure them that I will work hard for their needs at Queen's Park and in the riding.

At this time I want to pay tribute to my three previous predecessors in Cochrane North. René Brunelle represented the riding for close to a quarter of a century. René Piché followed in his footsteps and represented the riding for five years and was followed by René Fontaine who also represented the riding of Cochrane North for five years.

Cochrane North is one of the biggest ridings in northern Ontario. It covers thousands of square miles in size and is characterized by many small towns which are single-industry towns. Mostly sawmills and pulp and paper mills make up the area of Cochrane North. It also has a number of powerhouse operations located along the Missinaibi, Abitibi and Mattagami river systems. Its scenery is magnificent. Countless square kilometres of forest, lakes, rivers and streams dot the landscape. I invite all the members to come and visit my riding and experience the vastness and meet the friendly people.

Being a former millwright at Spruce Falls Power and Paper Co, I am pleased by the many initiatives regarding labour that the government has planned for the north. We will be ensuring that workers have the right to freely exercise their right to organize. Also, we will be establishing a wage protection fund for employees which will secure some income to families that have lost jobs due to these tough economic times. Raising the minimum wage to 60% of the industrial wage will help these people to have a better standard of living as well as create a better economic base.

This throne speech is about being fair to people. We want to work with people to establish better living standards and rights for all. We want to encourage people who were left out of other governments so that everyone is heard. That is why we will work with the local governments to create strong partnerships in all areas.

Cochrane North has one of the highest percentages of francophone population. In Cochrane North, 63% of the people speak French. I am proud that this government is working with the francophone community to ensure its rights. I might add that my three constituency assistants in Cochrane North are bilingual, and I myself am working with a tutor to improve my French as a second language. I am looking forward to being able to address the assembly here in my second language.

The government is also committed to looking at and devising a new tax system. We will set up a commission called the Fair Tax Commission to make sure there is a more equitable tax system for the people of the north.

I am proud to be a part of this government that is aiming at fairness for the people in Ontario and especially for the people of Cochrane North in northern Ontario. I thank members for the opportunity to express my views.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to participate in this debate? The member for Mississauga West.

Mr Mahoney: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am pleased you remembered the riding. Thank you very much for that introduction.

It is truly my pleasure to rise in this House once again. I have not had the opportunity since that fateful day of 6 September when many of us—none of us here; some of the members opposite, I guess, but none of us—received a surprise about the outcome in our own ridings. It is a pleasure indeed to be back and to address the House on the throne speech and perhaps some other issues that might be of some interest.

I want to make a comment, though. I was talking to the member for Durham East, the MPP for Sam Cureatz's old riding. I was talking to him about his predecessor, who I am sure he would like to speak to. When he spoke in the House on very many occasions, he would address what he called "the great Liberal backbench over there," and he referred to us as trained seals because we were trained to applaud whenever a minister stood up and said the slightest thing, however inconsequential it was.

I just want to tell the members opposite that they have gone to new heights. They make us look like pikers when it comes to—all of it, really. I am deeply impressed. The timing is excellent and I must give the credit to my counterpart, the whip for the NDP, who obviously is truly the iron lady and who obviously has all of the members opposite trained. They have their notes down and I am truly impressed, I really am. I say that with sincerity, because I was told, and it is obviously untrue, that the first time the bells rang in this House, half of the members opposite would leave for recess and the other half would think it was a coffee truck. But that is obviously not the case. They have obviously done their homework and they have studied this. I am particularly interested in how they are reacting.

I would also, though, just caution the members opposite, as our dearly-departed-from-this-place friend Sam would do. That is that while they are sitting up there in those seats, where on a clear day they can see the Speaker, while they are way up there they really want to be down here in this little row over here with the big guys, \$27,000 a year more over here. But as they are sitting there, they are going to feel a little frustrated. They are going to be frustrated because of documents like the throne speech, which do not address the doctrine, or the dogma, depending upon your point of view, that socialists and the NDP have espoused for many years. They are going to get upset when they see their Premier standing up there and looking like David Peterson or, God forbid, Bill Davis. Already I see it. His hair is getting a little greyer. I do not know if that is by design. I am expecting a red tie any day. He has an \$800 doublebreasted suit and he looks the part.

He is perfect. Maybe it is the chair in the corner office of the Pink Palace that creates that sort of ambience, I am not sure.

Members will also notice, by the way, that question period is not answer period. I do not know if members have noticed that yet, but we do not get answers to any of our questions and the little lobs that the members opposite throw over, "Dear Mr Minister, can you tell me what wonderful things you have done for the people of this province in the past seven days?"—tough, tough questions. Those little lobs that members throw over are not going to get answers they can take back to the folks who are the real left-wingers who elected those guys. Remember that. Because anything they do in this Legislature is not going to help them. What is going to help them is what they do on the ground back home.

1540

I have a unique perspective of the position they are in because of my upbringing. You see, I grew up in a very socialist family. My dad was a labour leader of some note, if not some notoriety, and I grew up with a number of very fascinating people around me. As a matter of fact, I must tell members that when I was a young, somewhat heavily influenced teenager at high school—

Mr Curling: Younger.

Mr Mahoney: Younger, as my colleague has said—I actually ran in a high school election as Tommy Douglas. Guess what? It was in a pretty well-to-do community in Etobicoke and I won, much to the chagrin of the bourgeoisie parents who were there. I was quite proud of that, but I have to say that the way I won is that I sort of promised certain liquid refreshments and company to my constituents to get together the odd time with each other. It was in a very similar way—not based on any solid platforms, but rather on some little tricks.

Now I am seeing exactly the same thing happening. I grew up with people—Tommy Douglas was at my wedding 21 years ago. David Lewis was an extremely good friend of the family, and he was around all the time. Even a socialist who finally got smart was around from time to time, a guy by the name of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. So I grew up with this background of all these socialist hordes invading my rather large family. Tremendous labour movement people like Johnny Barker from Sault Ste Marie, a wonderful trade union guy, terrific solid guy; Ivan and Ollie Campbell, great friends of my family, of my mum and dad; Larry Sefton, members all know Larry. They are all taking orders from Leo now. Well, Larry used to give the orders to the party in those days. Lynn Williams, we all known Lynn, the president down in good old Pittsburgh. Well, he used to be right here; he used to be district 6 director.

I grew up with all of these folks. A number of these people are no longer with us, unfortunately. They have gone on to that great labour union in the sky. They are in the blast furnace or they are up in the clouds having a good time. They would roll over in their graves if they saw how this supposed traditional CCF/NDP socialist

government has put together an agenda. The Agenda for People laid it out. The Agenda for People said what they would do. The then Leader of the Opposition was right over here, standing up, saying what he would do if he were Premier. Now he has just leaped across the floor and all of the friends of my family would roll over in their graves, because what have they done? What they have actually done, amazingly enough, is transformed themselves, believe it or not, into Liberals.

I am upsetting my colleagues on this side of the House. I am upsetting my colleagues on this side of the House by suggesting that these folks are Liberals, but the reality is, the left wing over here and the left wing over there, they think they are part of a socialist movement, but what have we heard in the first week of getting back to work in this place?

Mr Tilson: They're really Liberals.

Mr Mahoney: Of course they are. There are even some Tory little lines that come down. I heard the honourable Minister of Transportation, who I thought was a wonderful guy over here with all his hard-hitting questions and his points of view, stand up and announce—and this is for the Tories in the room—that he was actually going to set aside a transportation corridor on Highway 403. I could not believe it.

When Highway 403 opened in my city, I was a member of city council. Guess who the minister was? It was Jim Snow, and there was already a transportation corridor along Highway 403. As my honourable colleague the member for St Catharines said, "We should give Ed Philip a third hand so he can pat himself on the back a little bit for making all of these announcements that even go so far back as the Conservatives. I find it hard to admit that they did some things well, but they truly did, and Highway 403 is one of the solid things done by that administration when it was in power under Jim Snow as the Minister of Transportation.

Take a look at some of the other things that the Minister of Transportation has announced. He is going on about all of the promises our government put in place with the \$5 billion we announced in spending in the greater Toronto area for transportation, and yet he is trying to pretend once again—it may not bother him right now, but when the member has to go back to Oxford—by the way, I would have loved to have seen the new member for Oxford debating with Charlie Tatham on a platform; that must have been a hoot; that must have been absolute entertainment.

Mr Curling: What about the accident? The accident of Peter Kormos. What about him?

Mr Mahoney: Oh, never mind Peter. Peter, have a seat. Nice to see you here. Good to see you come; good to see you go. Peter, if you ever pass by here again we would appreciate it.

He will know that when he has to go back to Oxford to some of his group homes or his homes for battered women—we heard a great litany of comments from the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues

announcing everything the Liberal government had done. This is a bit of a strategy and a ploy that I see on the part of the Premier, where his party wants to be nice. I see him over there even applauding some of our members' statements. The camera does not pick that up, but the Premier sits there and says, "Oh, that was a wonderful statement." I do not know when all of this nonsense is going to stop and his party will start to realize that what in fact is happening in the leadership, in the little group—how many are there in the apocalypse now? We are not sure. Are there still only four? There were four in ours; there were four guys who ran it.

Let me tell members something else, by the way. What they really have to do if they want to move down into the front benches is lose the next election. I am proof positive. I was way up there, way up where the member for Oxford is, okay? We sort of lost the election, you might have noticed, and now I am getting closer to the front. You never know, when we go out and win the next election I might even be down in there or down in there. I do not know. I think it could be close; right down in there. So that is the strategy members have to adopt.

What I want members opposite to do is look to their right and then look to their left and recognize that the people on either side of them will not be back here after the next election. Cureatz used to tell us that. I looked to my right and there was Gino, and he is gone, and I looked to my left and there was Keith, and he is gone. So Sam must have known, surprisingly enough, what he was talking about. He must have known. But in the case of those guys, I would also recommend they go look in the mirror, because they might find out there is somebody in there who may not be back here next time, especially when they have to go back to their constituents and tell them that this great leader of the left, this great demagogue of social democracy, is in fact a Liberal in disguise. Oh, it is obvious.

Let me tell members that people like Larry Sefton, if he were here, would tell them that. He would not kowtow like Leo and Bob and the boys. He would not do that. He would get up and he would tell the straight goods, that this man is not following his doctrine and he is leading members down the path to ruin. He is leading members to the point where they will be defeated without a doubt in their next election. So let them enjoy paradise, if this is what they think it is, while they are here.

On some of the really interesting issues, the one area where I noted there was a departure from good Liberalism—and it bothered me because it is such an important area, if I could be serious just for a moment—is education funding. When we came into power—well, five years ago, those guys and we got together and made a deal, but the real true power we came into started three years ago—we had to face the fact that in the final year of the Tory regime there was \$72 million granted throughout the entire province of Ontario for capital for school funding. We increased that to \$300 million a year for five years, \$1.5 billion for school capital.

1550

I get the sense from the minister that her people had simply said, "Well, the Liberals did enough in that, so you don't need to do any more." I would ask the minister to look very closely at that, because frankly we even admitted when we were in government that it was not enough, that we needed to do more in that area, particularly in the high-growth areas.

As a matter of fact, the best Minister of Education, with respect, that the New Democratic Party never had was Richard Johnston. Richard would tell members that during our deliberations in the select committee on education, of which I had the privilege of being vice-chair for a number of years in the former government, we recommended a number of things to increase capital for school funding. The backbenchers are the ones, you see. It was us on the back benches who came to our Treasurer, to our Premier, to our Minister of Education and said, "Look, we think that you have to do something about this." We showed them and documented for them why it needed to be done, and they listened.

Now, if the minister wants to hear consulting, which some of her buddies over here are talking about, she should see if they consult with her. That is going to be the real test, whether or not they do. So I would ask the minister to read very carefully the reports of the select committee on education, particularly the report on financing. I would ask her to address the issue of capital school funding; I would ask her to address the issue of funding for the fixing up of older schools.

Hon Mr Kormos: Are people taking the member seriously? Where is your caucus?

Mr Mahoney: The Minister of Cowboy Boots had his 17 hours. Why does he not just relax and let some of us go, before he makes me go to a 17-hour filibuster.

Hon Mr Kormos: Do it. Come on, show us.

Mr Mahoney: Any time, pal, any time.

But I want to tell the members that the education matter is something that was not addressed in the throne speech. Very clearly there are issues that need to be addressed to give some direction from the minister's party, to put her agenda on the table. What the government has effectively done is recycled old Liberal promises. Let me tell members something: We were accused of recycling issues when we were in government but, by God, at least they were ours to recycle. What the government is doing is recycling Tory promises and Liberal promises.

Obviously, I am not in support of the throne speech. I would encourage the government and all the ministers to stand up and put their agenda forward so that we and the people of Ontario can understand where this socialist New Democratic Party wants to take this province.

Mrs Mathysen: I would like to thank the honourable member for Mississauga West for his kind remarks regarding our youth and enthusiasm and commitment to representing the working people of Ontario who have created the prosperity in this province.

I would also like to comment on his use of the S-word. He has called us socialist. Now, if he means by socialist that we are committed to caring for seniors, providing help for the disadvantaged, promoting a universal health care system and providing proper education funding, then yes, we are guilty, we are socialists.

Mrs Cunningham: It is not our usual position to stand and make response to comments, except when we are personally singled out from time to time. So it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to respond to the member for Mississauga West in his pointed comments with regard to when our government was in power.

I think basically what we should be talking about in this House when it comes to education is what is right for young people. I will say that there was some criticism mentioned today about some \$70 million being set aside for capital funding five years ago and that this was not enough money. That may be so, but I will remind the member for Mississauga West that during those times many of us sat on school boards and we were looking at accommodation of young people that would not only meet their needs but meet the numbers of dollars that school boards had, and that the government of Ontario had, in accommodating young people.

They were very difficult times of declining enrolment. There was not the need, because we were trying to utilize empty space within schools and within buildings. It was an efficient use of government money. I will take the opportunity to say today that in spite of the vast amount of money that was spent in the last five years, it simply has not been enough to accommodate the increased enrolment of young people across Ontario. Most of us heard that in our ridings during the election.

Also, the auditor said today—and I will point this out—that closer monitoring of underutilized schools is needed. Therefore, I am saying, for the sake of efficiency, this government and certainly the previous government have the responsibility to enforce their own programs. The regions made no attempt to ensure that boards were complying with their closure policies or to monitor school utilization rates. That is bad management and bad government. We expect new schools where they are needed, but buildings to be utilized as efficiently as they can be. That is what our government did, and I will take the opportunity to say so.

NOTICES OF DISSATISFACTION

The Acting Speaker (Ms Haslam): Before we go on, I have been asked to make two announcements.

Pursuant to standing order 33, the member for Mississauga North has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Labour concerning the minimum wage. This matter will be debated at 6 pm.

Pursuant to standing order 33, the member for Ottawa West has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Financial Institutions concerning automobile insurance. This matter will be debated at 6 pm.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr Mahoney: I am sorry that I struck such a sensitive chord in the third party. If I offended, it was purely by reciting the facts. I did not really intend it to be on a personal basis. We know what the contribution was to capital.

But I am also interested in the refusal of members of the opposition to say "socialist." Maybe we should have a class and all say it together, because in reality the government has told the people of this province that it has a socialist, democratic platform to put forward. If it wants to call it the S-word, well, let it go right ahead and hide behind that. If the government wants to continue to be a wolf in sheep's clothing, God bless: it can go right ahead and do that. What I am telling it is that the throne speech is an opportunity for any government to put forward in clear, concise terms what it is that it is going to do and where it is going to lead this province for the balance of this term, or at least until its next throne speech.

I am suggesting to the government, and I think the facts are clear, that what it has done is recycle the former government's programs, and even some of the former, former government's programs, rather than come up with directions that are going to satisfy the concerns of the constituents who it represents. The government should remember who it represents. Maybe I am wrong. Maybe what they did, when they voted was they went "uh-uh," like that on the ballot. Maybe it was an accident that the government got here, I do not know. But the reality is that it has to go back without the coattails of its Premier—and believe me, I know what that is like—to its constituents and defend a throne speech that is totally lacking in social democratic policies.

Mr J. Wilson: I would like to thank all members in the House for extending to me the courtesy of letting me deliver my maiden address in response to the speech from the throne. It is both an honour and a privilege to be surrounded by individuals of such quality and distinction who have helped me in easing my transition as a new member here at Queen's Park. These individuals are found not in just one party but throughout all three parties in the Legislature. I am pleased that we are all able to join together in the task of governing this great province.

As I rise to make my comments, I am struck by the largeness of the task I face. Following in the footsteps of the former Simcoe West MPP, George McCague, can be formidable, but I find comfort in the behavioural model he provided, a model of action which daily emphasized his commitment to his constituents and an undying loyalty to this province. For 15 years, George McCague showed us all that politics can be both honest and effective. He is truly a gentleman, a man of honour and integrity, and I know all members would join with me in extending our best wishes to George for continued success in all his future endeavours.

have been here before and are more familiar with the nuances of governing and opposition. As I cast that glance, I am struck by the overwhelming responsibility that we all share.

The public has grown weary of a system that continually falls short. None of us in this House needs to be reminded of this; we heard it at almost every door during the election campaign and we hear it every day with calls of complaints from citizens who have been taxed both physically and mentally by a political system that is out of date and ineffectual.

In the context of the current political climate, I feel the need to remind all members to bring to the Legislature a sincere belief that today they begin the process of re-establishing public trust in Ontario's political system. A new age in politics has dawned, and those who adhere to old practices will not find themselves recycled in four years but, instead, buried amid the landfill of broken promises where the former Liberal Premier currently resides.

While at Queen's Park we must not lose sight of the needs and aspirations of the people who have placed their trust in us. All honourable members are here because we entered into what philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau called "a social contract." That contract contains much of the emotional and moral commitment that we find in the institution of marriage, but I am afraid that the contract has been left in a precarious state. The public has become separated from the politicians they trusted to lead. The stakes are high but, with sensitivity and foresight, we can prevent social divorce.

As Rousseau said, "The wise lawgiver begins not by laying down laws good in themselves but by finding out whether the people for whom the laws are intended are able to support them."

We have to renew our vows of commitment to the sacred truth of government for the people. How do we go about renewing those vows? The answer is much simpler than most politicians let on. We have to get back to basics in representative government and keep first and foremost in our minds that we are elected to represent the people. We are not entrusted to represent Queen's Park to the people, but the people must speak through us to this Legislature.

The early actions of this government, as outlined in the throne speech, have done little to mitigate public uneasiness, and the timing could not be worse. At few points in Ontario's history has public outcry echoed more profoundly for a sensitive, commonsense approach to governing. While the throne speech is now fully digested, I am led to wonder if that outcry has fallen on deaf ears. Although the throne speech was sprinkled with lofty intentions, it lacked specifics. There were only vague references to policies, the timing of which remains a mystery.

The Premier has shown himself to be adept at the politics of deferral. In the face of a deepening recession, the socialist Premier seems to be asking Ontario residents to fend for themselves. Many of the people who voted for change on 6 September were looking to immediately cash in on that electoral dividend. Instead, they find themselves encountering "Please do not disturb" signs above

1600

As I look around the Legislature at the myriad of faces, some, like me, are here for the first time. Others

cabinet ministers' doors. The government is buying time as it tries to reconcile the Utopia it promised during the election with the cold, hard reality it faces in government.

The politics of deferral will not suffice. There was nothing in the throne speech that suggested the government is prepared to combat the current recession. There was a \$700-million commitment to rebuild provincial infrastructure, but what does it entail and how and where will it be implemented? Already, the seeds of cynicism are being sown in my riding of Simcoe West. I wonder how comforting the throne speech was to the residents of Collingwood, whose workforce has been decimated by the recession. People in Collingwood were hopeful that the throne speech would provide some glimmer of hope in their time of despair. But there was no strategy for job creation; no plan of action to create wealth and no industrial strategy to help offset mounting layoffs.

What the Premier is telling my constituents, who are suddenly jobless, is that he has no master plan to help better their lives, but he is committing himself to ensure that many others will join those who have been hard hit by the recession. The Premier is saying that in the absence of any job and/or wealth creation strategy, there is always the welfare system. Clearly, this is an unacceptable response on two counts. First, there is no greater dignity for a human being than the dignity of work. Second, in the absence of a job, people have to rely on a welfare system that demeans their sense of worth and contribution to society. People want to work. My constituents want to work. They need the government to focus less on hand-outs and more on creating an economic climate that provides the opportunity for meaningful employment.

Has the Premier ever lost his best friend? If he wants to know how it feels, he should just ask environmental groups in my area, who are curious to know the whereabouts of the NDP's commitment to safeguard the environment. The wide range of promises articulated by the NDP in the recent election campaign have been reduced and recycled, with the final product significantly watered down. Residents in the town of Wasaga Beach are scratching their heads, wondering when the government is going to come clean with its environmental pledges.

In her first real decision since coming to office, the Minister of the Environment elevated political expediency above social and environmental concerns by issuing an emergency certificate which permits six north Simcoe municipalities to truck their garbage to the Wasaga Beach dump. With just this one decision alone, the minister mortgaged her credibility as a friend of the environment.

Fact: The Wasaga Beach dump is nestled along the edge of the world's largest freshwater beach, and it sits on top of the Alliston aquifer, which provides water to over 90% of my riding. Fact: Recent studies show that the site does have a significant leaching problem. Fact: Just hours before the emergency certificate was granted, the dump's area was increased by 30%, on land which had never before been used for landfill. In fact, the creation and perception of a superdump in Wasaga Beach threatens the

town's economic lifeblood, namely, tourism and recreation.

Recently I met with this government's officials at the town of Wasaga Beach, and they made it very clear that the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation is opposed to the extension of this landfill site and to the issuance of the emergency certificate because this site sits within metres, as I say, of the world's largest freshwater beach. I think the government has clearly made the wrong decision in this case and I would ask the minister to review her decision, as I have done every day since coming to this Legislature.

While environmentalists wonder about the whereabouts of their friend the Minister of the Environment, the public chalks it up to just one more politician and one more government which has distanced itself from the will of the people. If the throne speech is a true indicator, then the much-talked-about crisis in health care has all been a mirage.

Let me lay the government's wishful thinking to rest, because there is certainly a health care crisis in my riding. The hospital in Alliston is carrying a deficit for one of the first times in its history. Why? Because costs for providing programs such as pay equity and the employer health tax have been imposed by the government without any funds to facilitate their implementation. The Collingwood General and Marine Hospital, portions of which were constructed in 1895, is desperate for redevelopment. Local residents have raised some \$4 million in startup money, and what they need now is a government green light to begin and a commitment from the ministry to help finance this project.

They have raised \$4 million from a population of 12,500 people. It is astounding, and I think the government, unlike the previous government, should look to the people of Collingwood as people who take a great deal of pride in their local health care system and in their hospital. They are willing to put their money where their mouths are, and I look to this government to bring in the redevelopment that is required in that hospital. There is an entire wing at that hospital which, as I say, was built in 1895, and in which the wiring is unsafe. It is very, very hot in the summertime, it is cold in the wintertime and we have no choice. We have some 37,000 hospital visits per year. That is just less than what Toronto General emergency room receives.

1610

In Collingwood, because of the ski and recreational activity up there, I have heard from constituents time and time again that it is not uncommon to wait five, six, seven, eight hours in the emergency room, behind a number of skiers who have broken their legs. It is time that this government addressed this problem, and I ask this government in all sincerity to do so. Health care accounts for one third of the government's operating budget, and a throwaway line in the throne speech is not acceptable to combat a problem that is racing out of control towards more cuts in services and jobs.

What of agriculture and tourism, two vital sectors to my riding's economy, not to mention the province's? Both seem to be secondary interests where this government is concerned. In its Agenda for People that was dragged out during the campaign, the NDP committed itself to an interest rate relief program and to preserving farm land. Yet when it comes to the throne speech, it is fair to say that farmers encountered a bleak harvest. The commitment to agriculture was condensed to one line: "We will improve our programs to stabilize farm incomes." I can only ask the Premier where and when.

In the throne speech the obvious is regurgitated, notably that central Ontario's tourism industry is hurting. But what is the government prepared to do about it? The federal government recently released a study which documents that the crisis in Canada's tourism industry is focused in Ontario. Misplaced and ineffective marketing and an uncompetitive tax structure are putting Ontario's tourism operators at a disadvantage. Compounding the problem is the Ontario tourism ministry's failure to consult with tourism operators, and correcting this lag in communications would be an important first step for this government.

I am not sure that all members of this House realize how important tourism is to the province of Ontario. If the throne speech is any reflection on the government's commitment, I do not think it realized how serious it is. It is the second-largest industry in Canada and the third largest in Ontario, generating some \$11.7 billion in revenues per year. In my riding, like almost every other riding in Ontario, one in three citizens depends on the tourism industry for his employment. It is difficult to understand why in the throne speech there is practically no mention of it. There is only a throwaway line on tourism.

The other point I would make on this one is that having spent the last several weeks visiting with tourism operators, I am shocked to hear that marketing people from the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation have never been in my riding. They have never been up to consult with probably one of the largest tourism associations in Ontario, which is the Georgian Triangle Tourist Association and Convention Bureau, which forms part of the Georgian Lakelands Travel Association. I am absolutely shocked that when marketing strategies are prepared here at Queen's Park, the marketing people, the bureaucrats, do not venture outside of Queen's Park.

I would bring that point to the minister's attention and hope that as a first step he would at least get his people out into the field to actually talk to the operators, so that we will not have reports like the independent study that came down last week from the federal government, which indicated, as I said earlier, that the problem with Canada's tourism is centred in Ontario, its misdirected tourism dollars, misdirected marketing dollars. I hope that this minister and this government will take a serious look at that and that all members of this House will realize the importance of tourism, not only to my riding but to their own ridings.

I would ask the Premier whether his government is serving all of the people, as he suggested in An Agenda

for People. Is his government's integrity well served by a Minister of the Environment who fails to consult and ignores countless pleas for a meeting with my constituents? Since day two of being elected, I have been pressing the government—and then when the minister was appointed—to meet with the people of Wasaga Beach about our landfill problem.

To date, the minister has not even extended to the council and mayor of Wasaga Beach the courtesy of an interim reply. It is extremely disheartening, and I cannot really express how strongly the people of Wasaga Beach feel. I feel that the minister has perhaps been misled, misinformed by her bureaucrats, and that she has made the wrong decision, and once again I challenge her to reverse that decision and to come clean with the people of Wasaga Beach.

Will the Premier's government gain the respect and trust of all Ontarians when his Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology reneges on a commitment to meet with the people of Collingwood when their hour of need is greatest? The mayor of Collingwood, labour representatives from Collingwood and a number of other municipal representatives were extended the courtesy by the federal government of meeting with the Prime Minister and seven or eight senior cabinet ministers in the last few weeks. They did that to ensure that the federal government was aware at first hand of the severe economic recession that we are experiencing in Collingwood.

To date, we have had no response from Ontario's industry minister. I did have a response from the Premier, who indicated he was too busy to meet, but no response from the industry minister or any of the other ministers of the crown in response to the pleas not just from municipal people, but also from labour representatives in Collingwood, that they may have the opportunity to come to Queen's Park to meet with ministers and senior government officials to explain at first hand the problems that we are encountering in Collingwood. Again, I urge the government to extend that courtesy to the people of my riding.

In conclusion, as we stand at the crossroads of our political future, we must all share in the responsibility of charting the direction of this province. This can only occur if the government consults and is responsive to the needs of all Ontarians. The public did not vote on 6 September for a reshuffling of desks in this chamber. They voted for change, change in the manner by which government responds to their needs and requests. This government would be foolish to lose sight of that.

My commitment to the people of Simcoe West remains as firm today as when I first set out on the road to public service. I, together with my colleagues in the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party, will continue to work day in and day out to bring credibility and honesty back to this esteemed House.

In the words of Winston Churchill, now all we have to offer is blood, toil, sweat and tears. This I offer today, tomorrow and every hour of my public service. To sit in this Legislature is first and foremost a privilege and not a

God-given right, and all of us here must never lose sight of the dreams, hopes and aspirations of those, our constituents, who have given us their trust.

Mr Ferguson: In response to the comments of the member for Simcoe East, and I think most of us were sitting here waiting very patiently and listening very intently to his comments, I appreciate his offer to work day in and day out on behalf of the people of his riding.

Perhaps he can start working on behalf of the people of his riding day in and day out by himself and convince his colleagues in the Conservative Party to contact the federal Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister and talk to them about their high interest rate policy, talk to them about the overvalued dollar and talk to them about their free trade policy, which are leaving thousands of victims in the wake of what is an economically disastrous policy, as I think everybody in this House would agree.

Mrs Cunningham: I listened with care to that comment. Yesterday we sat in this House and listened to what we thought was a very good first speech by the member for Oxford and we would not have pretended to criticize by passing the buck either to former members or former governments. We respected what he was saying.

I know some days we have fun in this House, but on behalf of our member who made his first statement with the sincerity that he presented to the public in order to be in this House and represent the citizens of Simcoe West, and certainly on behalf of our caucus, I would just like to say we will deal with any issues that have to do with the federal government as we did in our campaigns ourselves.

But I think all of us are in this House right now to make decisions, make policies and make action that will help citizens across the province of Ontario, and none of us can afford to pass those responsibilities to another level of government.

1620

Mr Hope: First of all, I do compliment the member on his first address, as this is my first time in this Legislature.

Mrs Cunningham: We'll compliment you.

Mr Hope: Thank you, Dianne. I knew you would.

The part that the member raised about the issues about job losses, the issues about what is faced in his community—and I guess I respect what he has to say, because most of us today sitting on this side of the government are faced with the same situations that he was faced with and that is why we are here today representing the government.

But I must not forget that it is through probably the same education course that he went through that I went through, that of our previous government, the Liberal government, which always stated that its doors were open and the lights were on. The only problem we had is that nobody was ever home. Now we see today as the opposition government the lights are on but unfortunately nobody is sitting in the seats to listen to these addresses.

But what I do have to commend the member on is the way he has put it out. He has put it out crystal-clear, and I guess most of us on this side of the government share some of the same concerns he does, dealing with job losses.

As coming from my previous life, I was a president of a local union of the Canadian Auto Workers, little Bob White, and I was also the president of the Canadian Labour Congress and of the Chatham District Labour Council. I was very proud to hold those positions. That is where I gained the ability to be able to get political knowledge, because the unfortunate part is that our school system failed us, we did not learn about Canadian politics, we do not understand.

The Deputy Speaker: Your time has expired.

Mr Sutherland: I want to respond to the comments made by the member for London North. I do not think my colleague the member for Kitchener was trying to imply that we were taking exception to the speech. I think what he was implying was that we all do share a common concern and part of the reason that his riding is being affected so much and is having so many economic difficulties has to do with the federal government's interest rate policy and other things.

All we were asking and the member was asking is that since the federal government does not seem to be listening to the people of this country and certainly does not seem to be listening to us, then maybe, just maybe, the federal Conservative Party and the government would listen to members from the provincial Conservative Party. We are hoping, certainly hoping, that maybe they would have a little more success than we are able to and than the rest of the people in this country seem to be having with the federal government.

The member is quite right that we all do share a common interest and we all do want a healthy economy, whether it is for his riding or for all of our ridings. I think that is all the member was trying to say here and I do not think the exception that seemed to be taken by the member for London North needed to be. He was sharing a common concern. We are not trying to pass the buck. The main concern is the federal government's high interest rate policy.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the member for Simcoe West wish to reply? Is there one more? I am sorry. I apologize.

Mr J. Wilson: Thank you, Mr Speaker. No offence taken from the—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I made a mistake.

Mr Mammoliti: I just want to close that statement, my colleague's statement, by saying that a Tory is a Tory is a Tory. Thank you.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. We will start your two minutes again. The member for Simcoe West.

Mr J. Wilson: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Now surely to goodness all members when they were campaigning in the last election got it at the doors. The people were tired of old rhetorical politics and they wanted a change. Clearly they voted for a change and that expression came out in those people being on the government side.

I think the point to be made is that we do not need any more of this rhetoric of a Tory is a Tory is a Tory. It is rhetoric. Those people are now responsible; they are the government. We will be as patient as we must be to give them time to bring in programs and to address issues, but they have been in government for quite a while and they did set out a very specific agenda during the campaign.

I have attended three union rallies in my area in the past couple of months and I keep hearing the same old rhetoric from members of the governing party. I think it is time for them to stop the rhetoric, sharpen their pencils and get down and do some work about job creation and creating economic prosperity for this province. They should not think they are going to be able to shove the problems off to another level of government because we will make it clear, as I am sure our other friends in opposition will make it clear, to the people of Ontario that the members opposite are now responsible for an economic strategy, for instance, which we have heard nothing of from their government, on how to get this province moving again and out of this recession.

My remarks simply are that the people of Colingwood cannot afford to wait for great lengths of time while the government gets off the 20-year rhetoric it has been on for years and sits down to address the issues. So if there is anything I can suggest to make members' lives easier, it is to sharpen the pencils, sit down and start to address the real economic problems of this province.

Mr Frankford: I want to take the opportunity of congratulating the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere on his appointment to Speaker. I am delighted that the voters of Scarborough returned him to the Legislature and that the members of this House will have the benefit of his experience and ready wit. I personally have the honour of having been elected for Scarborough East, a riding adjacent to his. This is the first time that our party has been elected in Scarborough East and it is a role that I accept with humility.

Until this election, as members are aware, I had been working as a physician. I have enjoyed providing medical care to people in Scarborough and the east end of Toronto since 1968. Like a few of my colleagues on this side of the House, I did not anticipate being on the government benches when I agreed to stand for election. It was only as the campaign developed that we began to sense the surge of support for the message that our party was giving.

I recall that there have been other physician-members of this House who have represented different parties with distinction. The member for Etobicoke-Humber, from the Liberal Party, has returned to this House and I assume that the presence of a psychiatrist will continue to be of benefit here. Dr Bette Stephenson, Dr Bob Elgie, Dr Mor-

ton Shulman, Dr Jan Duksza and Dr Charles Godfrey are colleagues who have served here within my memory. I believe they are all recognized as having made valuable contributions.

I believe that the experience of family practice is a useful qualification for this House. You deal with a wide range of problems and get an understanding of people's needs. You become familiar with the health and social service system. You learn the extent of society's resources and do your best to allocate appropriately. You have to do this with tact and diplomacy.

Scarborough East is a large riding that is part of the greater Toronto area. It is a largely residential riding with very little industry. It contains some of the most affluent communities of the city of Scarborough as well as some of the more socially disadvantaged. There is a mix of housing types: single-family homes, high-rise apartments and several non-profit co-operative ventures. I am pleased to represent all constituents of my riding equally.

Our riding is bounded to the north by Highway 401. The rail line passes through it and we actually have two GO stations, Guildwood and Rouge Hill. There is considerable traffic through the riding on the major arteries. Although we are adjacent to Pickering, there are few direct traffic links because of the presence of the environmentally sensitive Rouge Valley.

I very much welcomed yesterday's announcement by the Minister of Transportation about improving the links among the various transit systems serving both our riding and those that abut it. Any move towards a greater use of public transit will have many desirable effects, including diminished use of non-renewable resources and less demand for capital expenditure on new roads.

One approach that the World Health Organization is encouraging is what it calls a healthy public policy. In other words, we should be looking at the health implications of all decisions we make. Transportation policy, for instance, can make a difference to such things as access to medical care, the risks of traffic accidents, global warming and the greenhouse effect.

1630

Members may have seen an article in last Saturday's Toronto Star quoting the renowned urban theorist Jane Jacobs, to my mind one of the most important thinkers alive in our province. She points out the vital importance of snow removal for the health and wellbeing of seniors. A healthy public policy requires a co-ordinated approach by all levels of government and awareness of the health impact of decisions.

I am pleased that the speech from the throne states that our health and social services must be the best we can afford. I am glad that I came to live and practise in a country with one universal health care system. We can look south of the border to see that a non-system is both more expensive and fails to give necessary coverage to many of the most vulnerable. Various initiatives already exist to reallocate health spending.

I welcome the opportunity to work with professionals, community organizations, workers and consumers to

achieve effective, rationally planned health care delivery. We have had a number of reports in recent years advocating new approaches to health. I share the belief that we can find ways of providing better services after examining the results of our spending.

My riding contains one of the three campuses of the University of Toronto as well as part of Centennial College. The throne speech's commitment to strong, publicly funded educational institutions will find strong support with us. We must ensure that there are no barriers to access to higher education, financial or otherwise.

Scarborough East is bounded to the south by Lake Ontario and to the east by the Rouge River. This makes our population particularly sensitive to preservation of the environment. They are, for instance, concerned about issues of contamination of water and soil. They are looking to this government for initiatives about water quality. The natural beauties of the lakefront and the Rouge Valley must be preserved by us for present and future generations.

When I was asked to be the candidate for Scarborough East, it was pointed out that I would feel comfortable running there because the census indicated it had one of the most British populations in Metropolitan Toronto. However, I am sure that changes in the population are occurring in Scarborough East, as they are elsewhere. There is a co-op building housing native people. There are people of many more nationalities than is generally realized. They are home owners, renters, and some are refugees living in temporary accommodation. I welcome the emphasis given in the throne speech to issues of multiculturalism and to the multiracial diversity that is becoming more evident in my riding.

I very much appreciate the opportunity of being here and responding to the speech from the throne. I do not believe that we have to make unacceptable choices between social justice and social expenditures. Many of the countries with the highest living standards are those with social democratic governments or those built on social democratic values. I am encouraged by the strong intent of our government to develop a partnership in all sectors of society. I believe that this co-operative approach is fundamental to the kind of government we will provide.

Mr Henderson: I would like to extend a welcome to the member for Scarborough East. As a medical colleague, I noticed that he was not the only physician who happened to be carrying the banner for his party last September. The gentleman who ran against me in my riding also was a doctor and I must say that if one or other had to be elected, I am very pleased that it was the member for Scarborough East, not him.

Being a physician in this Legislative Assembly has gotten to be a little lonely at times. Although we are on opposite sides of the House, I want to say that it is very refreshing to have a colleague around, and I hope that we will be able to agree at least some of the time on directions in the health care system.

The helpfulness of being a doctor in this assembly is something I am not so terribly sure about. I found it lone-

ly at times and very stressful at times. I published a paper in the Ontario Medical Review a few years ago talking about the differences in mental set and the differences of style between physicians and legislators that some of my medical colleagues have enjoyed and perhaps the member would also. I once asked Stuart Smith about that, and Stuart said it was of no use at all to be a doctor around here. He had to simply set that aside when he became a legislator and start all over again learning how to do it.

One point I wanted to ask the member about has to do with the health care system. Physicians, as he knows, are very keen to have binding arbitration to address the discrepancy in fees that they have experienced over the last few years, and our government did not agree to that. His leader indicated shortly before the election that he supported it. Does he agree with him? When does the process get under way? When will the arbitrator be appointed?

Mr Beer: I too would like to welcome the new member to the House and note that a number of years ago I had the privilege of running in Scarborough East, although regrettably for me I did not have the opportunity, as he has had, to actually serve the constituents in this assembly, but I have some sense of the area, the concerns and the issues, a number of which he mentioned, particularly around the environment.

One issue I would like to put before the member, again using the comments our colleague has just made around the fact that we have several physicians in the House, is that he would use his influence within his party and within the government to ensure that the initiatives go forward that have been taken in the area of long-term care. I think we were concerned not to hear more specifically what steps the new government was going to take to ensure that in fact that does go forward.

I think we all recognize that we cannot depend solely on hospitals, on institutions, to meet our medical needs, and I believe there was a consensus within this House around the various measures that were going to ensure greater community participation in providing health care support services for seniors and for the disabled. I think it is an important point that all members want to work together on to ensure that we put in place a system of long-term care that will in fact be unrivalled not only in Canada but, I think, in the world. I would hope the member would lend his voice to that.

Mr Elston: To the new member for Scarborough East, first, welcome, and second, I noted with great pleasure his election because I know of his great commitment, not only in the medical field, but I know he has been quite active in community activities. In fact, at one time or another he used to come and see a former Minister of Health in his office and we used to have some great conversations about the things that could be done in the Health ministry.

Now that he is parliamentary assistant, I hope he will carry on his traditions of local and close work in the community. It is a very important part of members' roles here to represent their own constituents well, but as a parliamentary assistant he has a much broader role to play.

I might also note that one reason I rose today to give a couple of lines of congratulations and welcome to the new member is that when he last opened his first new community office, I was invited to participate in that opening. I would hope that when he opens his new community office as member for Scarborough East, he would extend me a cordial invitation to at least cut the ribbon to this new community office, as he extended me the courtesy of doing somewhere in about 1986.

I am quite available. I am relatively free to attend on short notice so that if he would care to, I would just love to give the opening address to his constituents and others as I did to his new-rostered patients at that community clinic. Might I say we are looking forward to his contribution in a very interesting forum, a new forum for him, but not highly different from some of the political activities that he was involved in even in those earlier days when I knew him as a community physician.

Mr Bisson: I regret to inform the member for Bruce that I will be going over to open that office for him, so he cannot have two; I am just letting him know.

1640

Mr Frankford: I would like to thank all the members opposite for their very kind remarks. The member for Etobicoke-Humber asked about the future for some settlement in arbitration with the profession. I am not privy to details of what the government and the profession have agreed on up to this point. I think it is clear that it is very much in everyone's interest to come to some contract sooner rather than later so there can be predictability in health costs and some stability in the lives of my colleagues in the profession.

I would like to thank the member for Bruce very much. I well remember his coming to the clinic, which I think was during the physicians' strike when we certainly kept open. I hope that it had provided him a little relief from some of the pressures he must have been under at the time. I would like the members opposite for their very friendly remarks.

Mr Cordiano: Mr Speaker, first of all let me congratulate you on your appointment as Deputy Speaker, and the Speaker as well on his victory, and also let me congratulate all those new members who were elected to the House for the first time, and the returning members. Obviously, some are my colleagues and others we will get to know as this session of Parliament continues and brings new legislation forward, and new commitments, and we develop new relationships.

The last campaign was indeed very interesting and no doubt will be reflected upon for many years to come by a wide variety of pundits. On 1 October, when the new government was sworn in, I sat beside my wife in the hospital as she was delivering a new addition to our family, my daughter Lara Marie.

[Applause]

Mr Cordiano: I thank the members. So it was not all gloom that day for a Liberal, at least not in our family.

I must say that as we mark this event with the throne speech, the government coming in and setting out its new agenda—I know members opposite will not like what they are going to hear soon—I think it is fair enough to say that the throne speech marked really a reversal, a transformation, a new phenomenon.

The ushering in of this government on 1 October held a great promise for those people in the province, from a wide variety of sectors and all walks of life, for a great wave of reform that was to continue that wave of reform which started, I believe, in 1985 with the assistance of the New Democratic Party, in the famous accord that we signed between 1985 and 1987.

I stand here and I know some of the members opposite were elected at that time. I know the Speaker was present as a member in this House, sitting as a member in this House, between 1985 and 1987. He is not here today, but I say to him and those members opposite who are veteran members returning to this Legislature that we ushered in a wave of reform during that period of time and there was a great agenda.

Mr Christopherson: Yes, our accord.

Mr Cordiano: Well, we shared that. I do not want to say for a moment that it was one or the other. I would say that we had a good partnership. It lasted as long as it lasted. Those were happy times for both of us, I think.

Mr Christopherson: More for you.

Mr Cordiano: Probably more for us, but I must say that those were reform days which saw a change unlike anything that has been accomplished before.

I was saddened when the throne speech was read on 20 November of this year. I am sure a great shudder went throughout the province for those people who heard what the Lieutenant Governor had to say about the new agenda. I must say that An Agenda for People, which the Premier talked about during the election, went out the window. It vanished. It disappeared. Where is the great cutting edge of reform? Where was that? We did not see it in this throne speech and I am sure there is a great lament throughout this province about the lack of initiative in terms of a reform agenda.

We used to think of the New Democratic Party as being the avant-garde of reform, of social change, bringing things forward in terms of reform. A great deal was accomplished with their help, as I have said, between 1985 and 1987. I give them credit for that, but I cannot stand here and honestly say that this will take place in the future as a result of this throne speech.

I know that the Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, used to talk about and used to chide the former member for Guelph, used to call him a Tory with a red tie. That was a criticism he levelled against the former member for Guelph. I say to the Premier today that I look across the floor and I look at what has happened, the great transformation, the new phenomenon over there in the NDP, and I see a Premier, a socialist—oh, excuse me, that is not an acceptable word for the people on that side, the government members. Please pardon me. I will use the

new term, "social democrat." I will not call them socialists any more. I will call them social democrats. If that is more acceptable, that is what I am going to use.

It is interesting to note that the Premier has become, I think, in the words of one of the articles that was written lately, a "conservative progressive." Is that not an interesting phrase to coin? I am sure that my friends in the third party are kind of shuddering in their boots wondering what sort of confusion this leads to. Where do we identify the three parties? A conservative progressive? My goodness.

I look at the Premier. He is a social democrat in a blue suit with a blue tie. I hope he has not lost his reformist zeal. I know that we were criticized as a government, no doubt about that, for losing our reformist zeal. But it took us five years. It took this new government only a month and a half to lose its reformist zeal, the end of an era and the beginning of one that is as yet unidentifiable with the reform agenda.

The throne speech, as I say, transforms the New Democratic Party, those great social democrats, if I could use that term loosely, into a new identity, one that is not recognizable as far as I am concerned. We see that through the throne speech. Instead of An Agenda for People, what we have is an agenda for power, how to deal with power, an agenda that says: "Let's take things really slow. We do not want to offend who will be offended by this new government. Let's do things very slowly. Let's be vague."

All those great promises and all those great expectations that were talked about so valiantly throughout the last election are no longer there. Take waste management, for example. No new tough measures were introduced in the throne speech with respect to specifics. Where is the imposition of taxes on excess packaging? It is not there. There is some vague mention in the throne speech about how we are going to reduce, reuse and recycle. Yes, those are all great statements to make. We use them. Previous governments used them. I am saying to the government that this throne speech gave it an opportunity to move forward with that reformist agenda.

It did not happen on waste management. On auto insurance, what did this government do? It announced a six-month delay and a period of consultation with interested parties. The Minister of Financial Institutions was in the House. He is not here now. But I say to him that he was as clear as could be in the last parliamentary session about where his party stood on this issue. In fact, we fought two elections on this issue, not just the one.

As far as people far and wide could tell, the governing party was as clear as could be. Its agenda was very clear. There was no equivocating in its agenda. It said it wanted a government-run insurance scheme. We had three years of discussion and debate in this House and in many other forums. We do not see that. Lo and behold, it is gone—six months of delay.

1650

Affordable housing: There was some vague token support to help the supply of affordable housing. That is the

only mention affordable housing got. Where was the commitment to build 10,000 non-profit units and in addition to that 10,000 more subsidized spaces that were talked about in An Agenda for People? No longer An Agenda for People; it is not there in the throne speech.

On child care, they promised 10,000 new, non-profit child care spaces and to subsidize 10,000 more. Where is the commitment to do that in the throne speech? No mention of any details in the plan. They are going to consult. The great wave of this government will be to consult and consult and consult. Now, we were criticized for that as well, so let me give a word of advice: Do not take too long to consult. The government knows where it stands on these issues.

These are the social issues that are of importance to Ontarians. These are the issues that make a difference in people's lives. These are the issues that make a difference to the average person in Ontario. I say that they have been telling us, and they told us as well. We did what we thought was right at the time, we increased day care spaces at an unheard-of level, at a rate which was phenomenal by any standard right across this country. We are proud of that record. But I say to this government: Continue with that reform agenda. This is not the time to stop. A great many people out there are waiting for those child care spaces.

On social assistance, I say we indeed have a very proud record. We introduced measures culminating in the Social Assistance Review Committee report. The recommendations that came out of that were introduced by the previous Liberal government. We are proud of that record. I think it behooves this government to remember that a reformist agenda calls for action, not words.

Nuclear energy is the biggest flip-flop of all. In the last election, the NDP called for a phase-out of existing nuclear reactors. What do we get in the throne speech? We get talk of an Environmental Assessment Board hearing, which will proceed. We do not get talk of plans to kill nuclear energy to come on stream. We do not get that stop-in-your-tracks kind of initiative which people were expecting. I think a great many people out there are really concerned about that. Now, I am not saying for a moment that that is not the right way to go, but they are concerned because they supported that party in the last election thinking that was what they were going to get. They certainly did not get that in the throne speech.

I do not want to be too unkind to the new government. I want to give them their due. I think there is mention of a variety of programs. What I am trying to say to the members opposite, those who are here today, is to remember those commitments. Remember them. Heed those words that were put forward during the last campaign. They should put forward the commitment and the initiative of the promises they made, because people out there really want to see a reform agenda.

My last point with respect to the throne speech is the fact that—this is perhaps the greatest indictment of this government—this is where Liberals and New Democrats part company. I know there was confusion and rhetoric talked about earlier in discussion here with respect to "a

Tory is a Tory and a Liberal is a Liberal." Well, I have to say there is a great deal of difference between us. There is a great deal of difference and there is a choice.

Now the people have spoken and they have indicated their choice. I am not going to doubt that for a moment. That choice is clear. But we part company with respect to the vision of the future, which says to people, "We are going to expand the economic pie for those people who are unfortunately facing a grim reality right now in a deepening recession, with very few prospects to enhance their economic life, to enhance their own personal situations." There is no talk about that in the throne speech. There is no vision of that future. There is no vision about how to enhance that economic pie, how to make it bigger so people have an equal opportunity to share in the wealth, to share by their own initiatives.

If the government does not create that, if it fails to lead in that regard, this government will be doomed to failure. I will give them this much—I want to be kind—there are measures in the throne speech to talk about redistributing wealth, wage protection, better severance packages. Those are all good things. But I must say that is half the equation. The other half is how to create additional wealth and how to create greater economic activity so that people have a share and people have an equal opportunity in that economic activity. Those are the measures. This is where we part company with the NDP. We share our quest for social equity and for social reform, but I think the people on that side of the House have to realize that that cannot come about unless the government creates the additional wealth. That pie has to get bigger. You cannot keep sharing a pie that is shrinking. There is not enough to go around if that pie keeps shrinking.

So I say to the members of the other side to remember their commitments, remember their ideals and remember that, in this place, it is easy to become cynical when they have power. We learned that lesson, I hope. I am sure that most of my colleagues share in that view. We learned that lesson. It was not so much that we forgot how to govern, it was not so much that we were not true to our ideals. Perhaps the failure on our part was to communicate what we were doing, for the most part. In fact, we did a lot and probably too much and that got us into trouble. But I say to the members opposite not to forget their ideals, not to forget why they were elected to be in this House.

Mr Hansen: I am glad it was not the throne speech, because it was all negative. I can say one thing: With our throne speech it was all positive. What I promised to the riding of Lincoln was preserving the farm lands and preserving the farmer down there. I did not hear that in the member's criticism. I guess that is one area where we have not gone wrong yet.

But auto insurance, this is going to be a big fix. The government will now have to fix up what the Liberals have put in. I have had letters coming in left and right, from both parties, left and right and centre, on auto insurance.

On the environment, I think members are going to see our government change how we think about cleaning up

the environment. Cleaning up the environment is not only recycling but cutting packaging, as the Minister of the Environment has already mentioned. We are going to go back to the cause of the problem, not correct the problem at the end of the pipe. The same thing with toxic waste: We are going to go back to the beginning to see whether we can change it there, not at the end.

Mr Bisson: The point I want to raise is that we are elected to this Legislature in order to govern for the benefit of the people of this province, in order to make this province a better place to live, somewhere where we can raise our families in a way that is equitable to all. The one thing that amazes me is that we sit here on the one hand and the opposition criticizes because we do not spend too much. They will criticize if we spend, they will criticize if we do this. It does not matter what the government announced.

Let us look at auto insurance. When the past government put in place the present no-fault insurance system we have today, there was no public consultation in order to allow the people of this province to have a say on what auto insurance should be in this province. Instead, what it did was pass it through in legislation. It did not listen to the people and now we, as a government, are set with the problem of having to fix this mess. The member across the floor says, "You haven't done anything in the two months you have been here." It took a while to get to the way it is. We need a little bit of time to fix it up. It is as simple as that.

1700

But the important part of the process is that the people of this province need to be consulted, the people in the end who are going to be using that system. We need to get the input from them so we can put together an auto insurance system within this province that reflects the 1990s, not go out and arbitrarily do something as a government and not listen to the people of this province. Instead, we have to turn around and we have to listen to what the people are saying, and put in place a program that is going to reflect what the needs of the drivers are today in the 1990s.

Mr Cordiano: I just want to say to the members who responded to my speech that we can talk about halfway measures, halting steps. That is all good; that is all fine. The NDP is in government now. It has the opportunity to make those decisions very clear. It has the power and it has a majority of seats in this House. I am not saying or suggesting for a moment that it should not consult, but what I am saying is that on those issues which were clearly discussed and debated for a number of years, it has to make clearer to people where it stands.

What I am saying about the throne speech is not so much about its vagueness. I am not criticizing its vagueness or its lack of clarity in definition with precise details. But it is not even close to being clear in terms of its direction. That is what I am saying. The direction is not there. There is no vision. There is a lack of vision. It is

rudderless, directionless. The ship is afloat in a storm and there is no leadership there.

I say to the Premier to give the kind of leadership he was elected to give, because if it is not there, well, he is not elected, he is not here. The weight is on my friend's shoulders. Enjoy it while it lasts, because it might not be here for ever.

Mr McLean: First, Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this Legislature. I would also like to welcome all the new members to the Legislature and welcome back those who were re-elected. It is a great opportunity to serve the people of this province, and members have that opportunity through this Legislature.

I appreciate having this opportunity to say a few words about the throne speech that was unveiled recently by Ontario's first socialist government. The only certainty in the vague report on 20 November, the throne speech, is that this government chose to beat a hasty retreat from the Agenda for People it promoted during the September election campaign, while trying to show just barely enough movement on a few issues to satisfy its traditional labour supporters. In short, this throne speech is a failed attempt at striking a fine balance between the heated NDP rhetoric of the election campaign and the hard realities of actually governing the province of Ontario.

The throne speech, the NDP's blueprint for Ontario, tries to be all things to all people. It contained a few interesting features and an equal number of interesting omissions. Some of those highlights include a study of all aspects of taxation, including a minimum tax on corporations, and increasing the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage over the next five years. Whether it is based on 60% of today's wage or based on the 60% in five years, the minister today did not appear to have the answer. It also contains a proposal to introduce a publicly owned automobile insurance system in the spring. Indications were that it would be brought in immediately.

I sat in this Legislature and have seen the lists that the member had passed on to him for hours and hours, indicating the concerns that were raised, and he would act on it immediately, but I do not see that happening.

It mentions the introduction of a common pause day pending the outcome of the Ontario Court of Appeal ruling on Sunday shopping. They also had an environmental bill of rights which would allow people to sue environmental offenders, and are developing conflict-of-interest guidelines for municipal and provincial politicians.

While there were some interesting highlights in the throne speech, I must say that I have some very real concerns about its failure to address some of the crucial issues facing the people of Simcoe East. I would like to spend just a few moments to outline the issues of concern to the people of my riding.

As my party's critic for Natural Resources, and as a representative of a riding which contains a unique water system that is popular for recreation and tourism, I was dismayed that the throne speech failed to address some of

the important issues in the environment, with regard to the Ministry of Natural Resources, which would pertain to the very serious problem we have in the spread of zebra mussels, which damage boats, fishing equipment, reduce the amount of food available to the young of many fish species and decrease the survival rate of fish eggs. They also destroy our marine heritage by corroding historically important shipwrecks. They attack and destroy municipal power plants and industrial water intake pipes.

The new government had an ideal opportunity to use the throne speech to declare war on zebra mussels through the Ministry of the Environment, and unfortunately it missed the boat. Action must be taken now to rid Ontario's waterways of this shellfish and prevent its spread to Lake Couchiching, Lake Simcoe and the Trent-Severn waterway. It is my understanding that it will be easier, and it is easier, to control the initial attachment of the larvae than to try to dislodge the shellfish once it is established.

There was also no mention of this government's interest in establishing through the Ministry of Natural Resources—I have not seen any program yet—a more equitable method of allocating adult moose tags without causing a decline in Ontario's moose population. Perhaps the government should give serious consideration to allocating one adult moose validation tag per licensed hunt camp in the province, with the rest distributed in a more equitable and fairer draw system than exists today.

As well, the throne speech contained no mention of revamping of the existing fishing licence system to ensure that the revenues are used for what they were originally intended, which was for conservation and restocking our lakes and waters to put more fish back into the system. As members know, it was the previous administration that established fishing licensing fees. Like this province's anglers, I said I would live with this system as long as the revenues were used for conservation purposes and restocking. But the money generated from the sale of fishing licences was dumped into general revenues, and some was even used to buy trucks—totally unacceptable. The throne speech should have mentioned that the fishing licence system would be cleaned up. This is another example of a missed opportunity, and I am sure the new minister will be wanting to address some of those issues.

The people of Simcoe East are worried that the throne speech skirted the issue with regard to transfer of payments to municipalities, like the city of Orillia, the town of Penetanguishene, the villages of Coldwater and Elmvale, or the townships of Oro, Mara, Orillia, Flos, Tiny, Rama or Medonte. Does this mean that the current government will continue its predecessor's policy of transferring responsibility for providing services from the provincial to the municipal level without the necessary funding to pay for these services? The policy of offloading provincial programs is breaking the backs of our municipalities and should not be allowed to continue.

It was also interesting to note that the throne speech failed to address the restructuring of county government in Ontario. It is interesting because during the September election campaign the leader of the New Democratic

Party came to Simcoe East—as a matter of fact, he was there two or three times—and said that there should be no restructuring without the voices of the people being heard on this very important issue. Personally, I am not so sure that Simcoe county needs to be restructured, but I do know that the entire process involved in the restructuring of county governments in Ontario has been flawed from the very beginning.

1710

The most serious flaw is that the former government restricted the membership of the restructuring committee, and the committee studying the restructuring of north Simcoe is made up of municipal officials mostly from south Simcoe, which has already been restructured by a bill in this Legislature this spring. So where are the elected representatives of the people of the townships of Medonte, Tiny, Oro, Orillia, Rama and Mara? None of them are on the restructuring committee, and these are the municipalities that will be directly affected by restructuring, but they are not on the restructuring committee. It is my understanding that the elected representatives of these municipalities have been denied information, or even observer status. The people of these municipalities have been disfranchised by the existing restructuring process. It is my hope that the restructuring process will be revamped, even though it was not mentioned in the recent throne speech.

I must say I was pleased that the new government has decided to proceed with the relocation of the Ontario Provincial Police headquarters to the city of Orillia. It was the logical and right thing to do.

I would like to point out to this government that in the past I have also suggested that the existing Huronia Regional Centre, which is scheduled to be phased out over the coming years, could be used for the care and treatment of Alzheimer's patients or the care and treatment of chronic care patients or as a Workers' Compensation Board facility for the rehabilitation and therapy of those suffering from work-related injuries. Again, none of these ideas was mentioned in the throne speech, but they are suggestions that should be given serious consideration by the government.

Since I am talking about health-care-related issues, I would like to know if the new government intends to honour the previous government's commitment to provide \$30 million for the redevelopment of Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital and the commitment to build a new Oak Ridge facility at the Penetanguishene Mental Health Centre. It is interesting today to note that the former Minister of Health, who came to Orillia to make that great announcement, is with us here today, and the \$30 million is growing with interest. I am sure the new Minister of Health is going to see that this commitment that the former minister made will be fulfilled in due course.

I was dismayed that Ontario's farmers were virtually ignored by the throne speech. This government must realize that it becomes a responsibility of any society to collaborate with its farming community and to ensure

productivity and fair distribution. This implies that we do our bit to ensure that the inheritors of the good earth in this country can stay on it, work it profitably and preserve it for future generations. Any modern province like Ontario that fails to protect and promote its farming community is heading for trouble, and a province that cannot be reasonably self-sufficient and secure in its production of food risks losing a precious measure of independence, security and prosperity.

My great hope is that this socialist government will wake up and become more aware of existing poverty, not just the urban poverty that this government tends to focus on but also rural poverty. About 30% of Ontario's farmers live in financially strained circumstances. The government must be made to realize that poverty is just as rural as it is urban. Farmers may not be unemployed but no matter how hard or how long they work they just cannot make ends meet and so they fall into debt and lose hope. Our farmers earn less than the minimum wage, even though they produce what we simply cannot live without. Our cheap food policy is neither kind nor just to Ontario's farmers. It was my hope that the throne speech would have addressed this imbalance, but I am sorry to say that it did not.

The throne speech promised "an ambitious pace of change" for Ontario, and a senior NDP government official promised there would be a "blizzard" of legislation by Christmas. We can only hope that this blizzard will contain legislation aimed at addressing the crucial and very real issues that face the people of Simcoe East and this province. The people of Simcoe East want a blizzard of legislation that addresses the hard realities of government, and not just another snow job.

We have talked about the Ministry of the Environment here today. I have had municipalities requesting meetings with the Ministry of the Environment. To date, we have not had a letter back recognizing that fact. I feel that government and its people, when they are dealing with local municipalities, have to have the decency to respond and explain why, if they are not going to do it.

I was also interested yesterday to see the Minister of Transportation, my good friend the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, who I have sat on committees with for many years—

Mr Elston: I remember when you called him something else.

Mr McLean: The member for Bruce knows me, that I am always very friendly and just. I do not take up some of the rhetoric that I hear some members speak about.

I was speaking about the previous government's commitment with regard to GO service to Orillia. I am sure that it is still on the books, that as I heard yesterday, the promise and the commitment will be fulfilled. But I do hope that it is one of those commitments that will be looked at and studied, and if it is determined that it is feasible and right, then I would expect that the minister would see fit to see that the commitment is fulfilled.

I have heard the Premier on many occasions talk about patronage and many of the issues that relate to

patronage. I have noticed that many of the members of the government side, friends who were not elected to this Legislature, now a majority of them have jobs with other members or with ministers. If that is not patronage, I do not really know what it is.

But I do want to say that many members who were elected to this Legislature were not elected because of government policies; they were not elected because it was the person who the voters felt was the most appropriate. Many people elected to this Legislature were elected and voted for because the voters wanted to vote a government out. So I do not want those members to forget that what they do for their communities and their constituents will determine whether they will be re-elected, and if their Premier continues to renege on the promises that he made, very few will be re-elected.

I happen to realize commitments that people make and I happen to believe in integrity. I do not happen to be one who would like to make a promise and not fulfil it. Somebody said to me the other day, "You know, there was a politician on the road and there was a skunk on the road. What would be the difference?" I said, "It would probably be the skid marks in front of the skunk." That is what they seemed to agree with. That is where politicians stand in the eyes of people. So I am here today to say a few remarks with regard to the throne speech. I thank you very much, Mr Speaker, for that opportunity.

Mr White: I want to thank my friend opposite for his very generous words of welcome and those of many of the members to the right of him who equally had very generous comments. The member brought up a number of very important items—the issue of moose tags, reform of fishing licences and zebra mussels and their possible entry into Lake Couchiching, all of which were absent indeed from the throne speech. It is very difficult to include all items in the throne speech at one time and I understand that the throne speech was an exercise in some brevity. We were able to accomplish it, I think, in somewhat less than an hour, and it hinted at the issues that will be coming to the fore in the course of our government. It did not encyclopaedically list them all, but indicated the direction of our government.

As the member indicated, in terms of the environmental bill of rights, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the thrust of our government, I think, is very clear. While some members opposite seem to think that there may be some difficulty with calling ourselves social democrats or democratic socialists, I am proud of, and I think all members of our caucus are proud of and confident in, the direction of our government. I want to again thank the member opposite for his generous welcome.

1720

Mr Klopp: Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you and the Deputy Speaker on your election.

I would like to make a comment, if I may, and some thoughts on the previous statements of the member across the floor with regard to agriculture. As a farmer, I have known for many years that agriculture has had many, many problems. I have seen many times where politicians

have fallen into that area where they make lots of announcements, and it is good for the politician. By the time it got sifted down through to the farmers, we got very little.

The previous government needed an election gimmick for us, the farmers. It came to \$40 million in the one for drought relief. That made the great papers all around Ontario, but when it came to reality it was \$5.80. Now, \$5.80 for most of us, if you know anything about farming, does not even barely pay for one cultivation in the field. It made me so cross that I ran. It made many farmers all over Ontario so cross that they voted for New Democrats.

I know the member's frustration. While he said it never got mentioned in the throne speech, it did get mentioned a little bit, but it does not really matter to me. I did not run as a politician. I have enough work at home. I ran because I thought I could do a little bit to make something concrete. As I mentioned to the Minister of Agriculture and Food the other day, "Jeepers, it would be nice to make an announcement," but I did not run for that.

I do not think farmers expect that. They want us to build a firm foundation. Do a couple of things right; do not make a whole lot of machine gun announcements. I share the member's frustration. I am glad he brought it up, but I think he is going to notice in this government that we are not just going to run fast. We are going to walk slow. We are going to do it right. I thank him for his concerns.

I know the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry is very much concerned about agriculture. I hope he keeps peppering us to remind us to do those good things, because we are all in this together. But I assure members, we are not going to be like the Liberals and Conservatives, who were just trying to make announcements for the paper. We are trying to do our job, what we are getting paid to do, and I truly believe that the people of Ontario are quite interested in that.

Mr Frankford: I was interested in the comments of the previous speaker and his reference to the Huronia Regional Centre. I would certainly like to increase my knowledge of what goes on there. I think that this government, as previous governments, has been looking very much at the balance between institutional and community care. To my knowledge, this is a good example of where we have to have a real opportunity of changing things. I just briefly would like to say that I would very much like to learn more and to see what are the alternatives there.

Mr McLean: I would like to respond to the last speaker first. I am certainly pleased to hear that. I certainly have raised this issue over the past 10 years in this Legislature, some 10 years almost, with regard to the Huronia Regional Centre, and I continue to do it. I look forward to the co-operation from the member with regard to that.

I would like to comment to my friend with regard to the zebra mussel. It is something that has been in the works for a couple of years and it is something that, if we can get a hold of now and try to prevent, it would be the most reasonable way for everybody, for fish habitat and

for all concerned; not only that, but the sewers and the intakes of all our municipalities that are involved with regard to the acid they are using to try to get rid of them and kill them. So it is a very major concern of mine.

I would like to respond to the member for Huron. Maybe I should inform him that I have probably forgotten more about farming than he will ever know. I have been farming since 1959. I was burned out in 1964. I still have a dairy farm and my son runs it. My good friend there in the back row, his former secretary is my son's wife and they have three beautiful children. We have a very successful dairy farm and it is through good management that this happened.

I have been looking at the relief for farmers. An Agenda for People said that up to \$100 million would be made available at no cost to the taxpayer. I would like to see that commitment fulfilled; I am sure all farmers would.

I just want to thank the members for their comments and look forward to working with them all for the betterment of the province of Ontario.

Mr Martin: Mr Speaker, I would first like to congratulate you and the Deputy Speaker in your new roles and wish you well as we move through this time together.

I also want to share with the House today how excited and happy I am to be here representing the good people of Sault Ste Marie and how excited I was at the swearing in of this new government, the new New Democratic Party government, and also how elated I was with my own appointment as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education.

But I want to say to the House that the anticipation and excitement that I felt at all of those occasions in the just-distant past did not come anywhere close to the anticipation and excitement built up in me as I waited and participated in discussions about and preparation of the speech from the throne, to which I will now speak. Having heard the speech from the throne, I was equally happy that I would then be more involved in the actual fleshing out of it, being consulted by the cabinet and Premier to make sure that I would have some intimate and direct contribution to make to those things that were put in place to speak to the needs of the people of Ontario, and that contribution would be invited.

I speak today to the speech from the throne as a person who has worked for a long time with people in need at the community level. I worked, as sometimes is said, in the trenches. As a social worker, as a pastoral worker, as a community development professional, a person who has spent most of his professional life working with people, one of the things that I did with my time that will help me most in my role as a member of this House was the development and co-ordination of a soup kitchen to meet some of the needs of the people in our community who are not being assisted by some of the programs that were put in place by previous governments.

In looking at the speech from the throne, I think we must put it into some context or else we miss the point here, we miss the exercise. The context into which I

would like very briefly to put this speech today, so that others might understand, is threefold.

First of all, I think we have to look at the situation in our province today and realize that there are still people out there—and I speak from my own experience of having lived in Sault Ste Marie for the last 10 years of my life—who are reeling from the recession of the early 1980s, who have yet to recover. What I am saying is that the Band-Aid effort of the previous government to take care of some of the victims of the recession of the early 1980s has not in fact worked.

Also, in the context of the situation that we find our province in at this point, I think we have to look at the failure of the Liberal government to implement a blueprint which had in it all of the seeds of some long-term resolution to some of the poverty issues in this province. A report, the Social Assistance Review Committee report, which was participated in very widely by people from all sectors of our province and which came out with some excellent recommendations which were initially presented and then backed off from.

1730

Those of us who are out there helping people looked at the implementation of the SARC report as an answer. We were excited about it and then very greatly disappointed. I think it is important here, in looking at the speech from the throne, that we realize that it is much more damaging to set people up for disappointment than it is to actually throw money at problems that are not going to have long-term impacts. So we, in the speech from the throne, have chosen to take our time and put in place policies and practices that will make some sense and offer some hope into the future for the folks that I have, on a daily basis, come in contact with in my community.

The second thing that I think we have to look at as we look at the speech from the throne is the fact that we as a party have been waiting a long time to be here. It behooves us to take our time, to be responsible, to do it right, to think it out and to consult, and after having done that, then to come out with more of the specifics as to how we see this province evolving.

The third and I think most important context within which this throne speech is couched and which all members should be cognizant of is the fact that we as a party represent, more than any other party elected to govern this province, a cross-section of sectors in the things that we did before we arrived here. We therefore can speak, I think, more honestly and with more integrity on their behalf and hopefully put in place things that will speak to helping the situation that they find themselves in in a more prolonged, long-term way.

I myself, as I have already told members, before arriving here, ran a soup kitchen. I was also a trustee with the separate school board in Sault Ste Marie and had a small business that I ran. The important thing here is the fact that I ran a soup kitchen. Over the last couple of months, I have had the honour and pleasure of spending some time with my colleagues and have discovered a number of

things about them that make them particularly qualified to be here representing the folks of Ontario. It gives me reason for hope on what we will produce as the future unfolds.

Frances Lankin was a founding member of the Ontario Coalition for Better Childcare; Randy Hope worked with the United Way in Chatham; Tony Silipo fought for heritage language programs, adequate child care and equal education opportunities for working-class and immigrant families. As a matter of fact, one of the most moving moments of my time to date in the city of Toronto was an evening I spent with Tony and Rosario Marchese as the Toronto Board of Education thanked them for the work that they did. At that meeting, we had representatives from all of the various ethnic groups in this city and, as the various leaders of those groups got up to thank Rosario and Tony, I was at times brought to tears because it spoke to me of the kind of people that I would be working with in the effort to make Ontario a better place for all of us to live. An exciting moment.

Elaine Ziemba, executive director of Meals on Wheels; Marion Boyd, director of the London Battered Women's Advocacy Clinic, active on issues of family violence, day care and housing; David Winninger, active with Amnesty International, Neighbourhood Legal Services and community health; Zanana Akande worked with the Ministry of Community and Social Services on children's services, the Elizabeth Fry Society and Women's Habitat; Dennis Drainville, active in social and economic justice issues and actually wrote in 1985 a book called *Poverty in Canada*; Richard Allen played a key role in assembling the largest anti-poverty coalition in Ontario's history, instigated dramatic marches in 1989 and was instrumental in bringing forward the Thomson report, or the SARC report as it is known; Pat Hayes, from the Essex-Windsor Campaign Against Poverty and chairman of the United Way there.

I think that if one looks at the throne speech as an opportunity for us as a party to finally get in writing as the government of this province the things that we hope for most for the people we represent and we plunk it in the middle of the kinds of people who are in the caucus of our party, and one looks at it in the context of what is happening out there today to the people in regard to the recession and that sort of thing, we cannot help, all of us, but be excited and hopeful just waiting for this government to unfold.

The Speaker: Before we entertain questions or comments regarding the member's speech, I would like to take this opportunity to remind members that it would be very much appreciated if we would refer to members of the assembly by the names of their ridings or by the position they hold, if they happen to be in the cabinet or the Leader of the Opposition etc.

Mr Beer: First of all, I wish to congratulate the member on his election and to his appointment as parliamentary assistant. I have often thought that the best job around this place is to be a parliamentary assistant, because that way you still serve on all the committees, you

can spend time here, you can do a lot of things, and yet you still do not have all that weight that the minister sometimes has to drag around. Also having been in the position the member is in now, it can be tremendously enjoyable. Even if perhaps I would have to say I hope he does not enjoy it for too long, I hope that none the less he enjoys it.

I would just like to make a couple of comments with respect to the social assistance reforms. We all understand that in the rhetoric of this place we sometimes talk about what is going forward and what is not going forward. But what I really would want to stress to all honourable members, in going back and looking at the program which the Minister of Community and Social Services before myself, John Sweeney, initially brought in and then which I had the privilege of working with as minister, is that in fact there are a tremendous amount of things that are going forward.

The kinds of problems that I think governments run into, that frankly I think the member will run into as well, are trying to find your way around getting the resources that you would like to attack on a very broad front and recognizing that within that particular ministry there are so many issues that you are trying to deal with—long-term care, with all kinds of support for a variety of groups—and yet still deal very specifically with the poverty issue, which I think is certainly one that we all recognize is most difficult.

I think the member can still build on a tremendous amount that was done. It is there. I think that he will find that there is support in the House to continue to build on the SARC report.

Mr Martin: I wish to thank the member for his kind words and assure him that our intention is certainly to build on what has already been put in place, to assess it, and certainly to listen to the former Minister of Community and Social Services speak about an inter-ministerial approach to this whole thing, because, as the member says, it is a much more complicated task, which I am discovering every day as I dig into the issues surrounding poverty in my position here. I appreciate what he had to say, and certainly our efforts will be to do just that and hopefully involve the member, invite him to participate in whatever way is appropriate as we do them.

1740

Mrs McLeod: A great many people were wondering what this throne speech would contain. This was, after all, the first significant presentation of this new government, the first major statement from a leader who had created great expectations that a province led by an NDP government would be a vastly different place, a place where hopes and dreams would be fulfilled, a place where the reality of people's pain could be eased and where the reality of fiscal constraint could somehow be escaped.

We might well ask, where are those hopes and expectations now just a few short weeks into the mandate of this supposedly vastly different government? What should we have sought to find in this throne speech?

We might have begun to realize even now that we would not be hearing from the visionary leader promising to fast-track Ontario to a new millennium. We have seen repeatedly over the last weeks how fast indeed this new government has been to retreat from the promises, how quickly it has acted to dampen the expectations.

If this sudden retreat from commitment seems surprising, it is even more surprising that we have seen at different moments in the past month a leader who may be more concerned with sending messages than with actually consulting and carefully weighing alternatives.

It is strange, I think, when a professed visionary retreats from promises apparently on the ground that he never thought to have to deliver on them. It is more strange again when decisions are suddenly made without even the consultation that would have been expected of a government committed to openness simply in order to send messages: a message, for example, to the business community in approving the sale of Consumers' Gas before considering the full range of options, discarding within a matter of hours 25 years of fundamental New Democratic principles of economic nationalism.

To make up to New Democratic constituent groups, however, another message was quickly sent in saying no to the ballet-opera house, this time without even the courtesy of signalling what was to come to people who have held this dream as their own and have worked towards it for many years, let alone taking time to understand the implications of the decision being made.

The decisions we have seen made to date have no consistency, no guarantee of commitment to past statements or policies or promises. There was no basis for predicting what we might find in the throne speech because there has been no predictability in what we have seen since this government assumed the responsibility of governing.

The need to send messages, however, was very apparent again in the throne speech statement about the so-called nuclear moratorium. Surely no one believed that such carefully crafted double talk would lead people to believe that this government could commit itself to both a nuclear freeze and an independent environmental assessment.

We might at least have expected, however, that we would have seen some recommitment to specific promises made earlier, some indication that *An Agenda for People* was indeed the agenda of this government. We are all certainly aware of the new Premier's belief that people do not want politicians to make promises that cannot be kept. It now seems that making promises that cannot be kept is supposed to be forgiven if you were not expecting to win. A very different message indeed.

In so many areas where specific commitments have been made in the past, we have now only vague indications of intent, statements as infuriatingly condescending as, "We cannot assume that spending more and more money will mean better services"; or "Strong, publicly funded institutions are crucial to lifelong learning"; or the remarkable statement, whether it has been offered as a discovery or as a warning—I am not sure which—that,

"Saying yes to some concerns means saying no to others." Welcome to government in the real world. In the real world, choices will indeed have to be made and we have no sense from this throne speech of what those choices will be.

We know that the Premier and the members of his government must have understood the need to give some indication of intent, some evidence of continued commitment. How could they not want to offer people the hope of adequate wages, pensions or support so that they can seek to live in dignity? How can the desire to ensure equity be denied? Who can now be unaware of the need for accessible, affordable day care? Who would not want to deal with the environmental problems that will otherwise alter the quality of life in the world that our children will inherit?

No one can quarrel with good intent in areas of policy which all of us care about. It is, after all, the desire to effect change, the will to reform that brings all of us here. After this throne speech, we might well ask when that intent will become real action.

During the last election we watched the electorate respond with enthusiasm to promises, promises that there would be under an NDP government a response to concerns never found in government before. Those of us who were then in government shook our heads at all of this and maybe, to be very honest, wished that we could make those promises too. But we knew that when you have the responsibility of governing you must work with all the pieces of the puzzle. You must do what you can but you can only do what is possible.

There will be many people who have reason to be disappointed that the promises made to them are not going to be implemented as quickly or as surely as they had expected. The members of this new government must also be disappointed, because I suspect that they too believed that much more would be possible. They wanted to feel the satisfaction of being part of a truly reformist government and the excitement of having taken giant steps towards a brave new world.

I understand that feeling. I have had the experience of hearing the previous Minister of Community and Social Services speak with passion and conviction of what we must do to change the myths of social assistance and free people from the welfare trap. I know the sense of commitment felt by all of us in our caucus, believing that implementation of social assistance reforms would be one of the most significant achievements of our term as legislators. We knew, when we were able to implement those first reforms, what it was like to be part of a truly reformist government.

I remember my sense of excitement when our plans for a new approach to long-term care were presented. All of the concerns about how to address the changing needs of our older population, all the knowledge about what needed to be done and all the ideas for moving in new directions came together in a pattern, a pattern for action. Again, there was the satisfaction of being part of a truly reformist government.

We experienced this sense of satisfaction on so many occasions with so much cause by responding to so many issues of real concern; day care, housing, the homemaker program, environmental protection, pay equity and education. I was glad to have been a part of a government which not only believed that education was the foundation of our future, but acted on that belief by introducing unprecedented new programs in areas from high-technology research to the earliest elementary education. I shared something of the pride when our Minister of the Environment received international recognition for achievements in recycling. Let me tell the members of the NDP caucus that it is exciting and satisfying to be part of a truly reformist government.

Now we can all acknowledge that this is a different day. Times are difficult and decisions about priorities are going to be even tougher to make than they were in better times. But let us recognize too that the needs continue to be real and they must somehow be met. Let us recognize very clearly that the decisions this government makes will determine whether people and communities survive and whether indeed the times will get better.

This throne speech is silent on too many pressing issues. There are too many unanswered questions that demand an immediate response. As a representative of northern Ontario, I am deeply offended that the throne speech offers only seven words that state one small part of the only too obvious. Single-industry towns are vulnerable. As a former Minister of Natural Resources, knowing the critical issues that have to be addressed in that area, I am dismayed that all the throne speech provides is the platitudinous observation that our forests must be regenerated.

The leader of the new government promised before he was Premier that ways could be found to protect both the jobs and the environment. What decisions will now be made about the future of our resource-based industries? Can that balance be found? There is surely no doubt that the resource-based industries must survive. Diversification in northern Ontario is easy to talk about and much more difficult to achieve.

All of us know that the issues are complex. There is no question that setting the right alternatives and setting priorities will be a very difficult task. We will just have to trust for the moment that this new government will take the time to understand each issue in its full complexity. As the opposition, we can and must ask if this government will truly consult, will talk to all Ontarians, will understand their very perspectives and the legitimacy of their very different needs.

At this point, all that we can do is ask because we have no assurance after these early weeks that there will be true consultation or consistency in decision-making. We have no sense that we can expect commitment to a vision or even to keeping promises made. We can ask and keep asking and we, with the rest of Ontario, will just have to wait and see.

1750

Mr B. Ward: First, I would like to make a quiet observation that, if the election did nothing else, at least it got rid of the bad habit that the opposition had of wearing those gaudy red ties. I notice around there that the ties seem to have disappeared, so I think that is good news.

The previous member's comments mentioned a reformist agenda that the previous government had implemented. I give credit where credit is due. The Liberal Party acted as a reformist party during the years 1985-87 when it was forced to adopt the New Democratic Party agenda at that time. As soon as they lost the support of the NDP, that reformist mode seemed to disappear.

Once again, I think that part of the reason for the defeat of the previous government was that it lost touch with the people of Ontario. They failed to listen and consult. They are going to get sick of hearing that from us, because I firmly believe that we were elected because we are a party that listens to the people of Ontario. Granted, the throne speech sets a good direction on economic and social policies, but the fact that we are willing to listen to the people is something they want.

Again, reference has been made that we have lost touch, or we have broken our promises. What I am hearing in Brantford, because I listen to the people, is that the people of Brantford have said we are setting the right direction and they are with us.

Mr Bisson: Again, I rise to the occasion. The members sit in opposition and say we are not moving quickly enough on this and that we are not moving quickly enough on that, that the throne speech is somehow vague. Those people were on this side of the House for some five years. The member for Brantford makes mention—I think it is a good mention—that a lot of the policy that was instituted in the time and some of the good reforms that were put in were put in from 1985 to 1987. There is no question about that.

The thing is that they had the opportunity from 1987 to 1990 to be able to implement some of the things they are trying to criticize us on now. I think the people of Ontario will recognize that you cannot change the makeup of this province in a matter of two months. This government is elected over a period of some four to five years, and it will take some time to be able to solve some of the problems this province now faces today. The problems, I think people will recognize, are vast. It is a question of the economy, a question of how some of the members sitting in the federal House are not instituting programs and not following the will of the people, such things as—I will say the bad words—the goods and services tax.

There is the question of some of the legislation that has been passed in this Legislature in the time they sat on this side of the House that affects the everyday people of the province. So it is going to take some time. It is not going to be done overnight.

We want and we ask, and we say to the opposition: Listen, the opposition as the NDP was there for a number of years. This is the first time we have been here. We

understand how frustrating it could be on the other side at times. We made the offer at the very beginning, and the Premier repeats it over and over again, that if members have something to say, if there is something members want to consult us on, if there is something they want to have input on, they have to be able to talk to us. But to sit there and to criticize for the sake of criticizing does not benefit the people of this province.

We say to the opposition: We are listening, but let's work together on this thing. Do not sit there and say we are going to solve it in two months, because they know very well it is going to take a year, it is going to take two years, it is going to take four years to solve some problems.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I would certainly like to give credit where credit is due. The member for Fort William has stated very explicitly that there is a great deal of silence in this speech from the throne. There is silence on such things as economic development. She has pointed to her area of the province, which is the north. There are seven words in this speech, about eastern Ontario as well. The seven words about eastern Ontario are that the "industrial and agricultural base are being battered," and then we go on to another subject.

There has been much begun in eastern Ontario, much in the way of economic development. In fact, an economic development conference that was planned for this month in this province, in that part of the province I am speaking about, has been postponed indefinitely. That is the kind of thing that is worrisome.

Everything in this province at this moment, particularly in eastern Ontario, and seemingly also in the north, is on hold. How long can these people in the parts of the province that are in the direst need be on hold? I certainly feel that new insights have been brought to the floor of this Legislature today by the member for Fort William.

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: What is the time limit? There are a number of limitations to these two-minute interjections, I understand.

The Deputy Speaker: It is two minutes, for a total of eight minutes, and the person who addressed or debated the throne speech has two minutes to reply, for a total of 10 minutes. Does that answer your question?

Mrs Marland: Yes, it does answer my question. It has become a very unfair process for all the members in the House, I would suggest, at this point, because if everybody took their 10 minutes we could get more speakers on. I thought there had been an informal agreement to waive the two-minute interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: That is the rule of the House.

Ms Haslam: The member for Fort William mentioned that we dampened the expectations. I will tell her what dampened the expectations. It was opening the balance sheet when we opened the books. That is what dampened our expectations for bringing in some of our policies.

She also mentioned 25 years of social democratic policies. Can you imagine the screaming if we had brought in all of our policies in the last two months? It is a situation of darned if you do and darned if you don't. I am pleased that our government is showing excellent leadership, making sound fiscal judgements. Who is not interested in poverty and social issues? Obviously the Liberals, or they would be on this side of the House and not us.

I agree with the member for Brantford that the best legislation the House saw and the Liberals introduced was as a result of the accord with the New Democrats.

I agree with the member for Cochrane South. Our programs will go forth. The throne speech has set a direction for us, a direction I look forward to.

Mrs McLeod: I am not going to take a lot of time to go over the record of this government from 1987 to 1990, although I would welcome the opportunity for that. I will simply say that at some point perhaps we will leave the rhetoric behind and begin to look at the record. The record will show that we did such things as the members opposite have commented on, such as the social assistance reforms and long-term care, in that period of time, along with introducing a great many other initiatives, even as we struggled with some of the reality of the expectations that were there, which we wanted to meet, and our knowledge that if you cannot have fiscal accountability, you cannot support the social reforms that we all believe in and all want to see come into place.

I want to use the time I have in this brief two minutes to come back to the issue of the promises, and the expectations that relate specifically to the promises that were made in *An Agenda for People*, because the honourable members across the floor will know that those promises were not only made; those promises were costed. The Premier made a point of stressing that it would be irresponsible not to cost the promises and not to tell the people of Ontario what to expect.

I want to suggest that the recession should not come as a surprise and should not create new ground that this government has to respond to, because the recession is in fact referenced in *An Agenda for People*. They were well aware that we were in a recessionary period.

The comment that they found a different balance sheet should also not catch those who have been a part of this House and of budgeting processes in the past. All of them will know that a balanced budget is achieved at the end of a fiscal year and a projected balanced budget is introduced at the beginning of the next fiscal year. But I can in fact understand that if people are not familiar with balanced budgets, it is because the member for Brant-Haldimand brought in the first one the province had seen in 20 years.

I am not going to go on with further references to the throne speech, other than to simply say that the Premier has called for this to be a kinder and gentler place. I think what we want to do is concentrate on discussing the issues in true parliamentary manner. We will debate the measures, not the man or the woman, but we will be

tough and firm on the issues because our goal is to hold this government accountable.

Mrs Marland: I have prepared a very worthwhile response speech here on the not-so-worthwhile throne speech of last week. In light of the time, and I am observing the clock, I will move adjournment of this debate and look forward to presenting my speech tomorrow.

On motion by Mrs Marland, the debate was adjourned.

1800

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 33(b), the question that this House do now adjourn is deemed to have been made. The member for Essex South has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given yesterday by the Minister of Transportation on trailers on Ontario highways. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter and the minister may reply for up to five minutes.

Mr Mancini: I have asked the Minister of Transportation to return here this evening to the Legislature to discuss once again his policy announcement which negated an announcement which had been made by the previous government to allow 53-foot trailers on Ontario highways. I gave the minister an opportunity in the Legislature yesterday on two separate occasions, both in my original question and in my supplementary question, to explain to the House how he came to the conclusion that he should in fact reverse an earlier policy decision which had been made by the previous government. I wanted to know the process the minister went through. I wanted to know whom he had consulted. I wanted to know whether he had talked to trade unions. I wanted to know whether he had spoken to individuals. I wanted to know whether he had spoken to the industry or industry associations. I wanted to know whether he had discussed it with the NDP caucus or with his cabinet colleagues, or was he told by the Premier that this is an action he should undertake?

The honourable minister, while trying to defend the actions of the government, refused to tell the Legislature in any way whom he had consulted and on whose advice he took this action. The minister told the media that he made this decision based on an incorrect public perception. That is the truth. He did not say, "I made the policy change because I have received studies, I have talked with the industry, I have received representations, and there is a dangerous situation going on out there." None of that whatsoever. These are the minister's own words: Based on incorrect public perception, he changes a policy announcement which had been put in place.

What does this change do? Does it better the industry? Does it make the industry more economical? Does it prepare the industry for the battle it is in for market share? Is there an environmental reason for doing this? On all counts, the answer is no.

The Roads and Transportation Association of Canada spent \$3 million doing an intense study and survey of

highway safety and of regulatory principles for inter-provincial heavy vehicle weights and dimensions. On page 24 of their brief—this is not my perception or the incorrect perception of the public, as stated by the minister, but detailed information gathered over the course of a period of time that has been published and not refuted—it states:

"Overall vehicle length: The maximum overall length of any combination vehicle will be 53 feet. Other dimensional constraints may preclude some vehicle types from achieving this overall length."

Then there is the section on commentary:

"The overall length of vehicle combinations affects the capacity and level in service provided by the highway system, particularly two-lane, two-way rural highways. Research has also demonstrated that the inherent stability of articulated vehicle combinations improves as the wheel bases of the tractor and semi-trailers increases. Consequently, we recommend overall vehicle length of 53 feet, and this is viewed as providing an opportunity to improve vehicle stability without unduly degrading the highway system."

We need uniformity. We are in competition with our sister provinces and the states which surround Ontario. The old provision which was negated by the minister without consultation with the Legislature, with the industry and with his colleagues—

The Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired. Thank you.

Hon Mr Philip: The announcement I made last week to the Ontario Trucking Association indicated that I am not prepared at this time to introduce the legislation permitting longer trucks and longer trailers. That was what Bill 96 did. It was not just an extension of the trailers; it was an extension of the trucks. There were two elements in that bill. My honourable critic in the Liberal Party fails to mention that. I said, in the text of a speech I made to the Ontario Trucking Association, that unfortunately the public sees the trucking industry as a major problem in terms of safety. I showed the figures in that speech, that that was not the case but there was a public concern.

I also pointed out that our own studies we have done recently showed there was a major problem in terms of brakes. It was in that safety context that I said we are not prepared to proceed with Bill 96 at this time. The member seems to indicate that somehow we have caused anarchy in the trucking industry and in the trailer-building industry because we are not proceeding with Bill 96. Bill 96 was so important to that government that instead of proclaiming it, it decided to call an unnecessary election. That is how important that legislation was to them.

The Liberal critic is suggesting that my saying we are not prepared at this time to proceed with a bill we voted against in opposition is causing anarchy in the trucking industry. The fact is that his government caused that anarchy in the trucking industry through its deregulation legislation that he supported. Indeed, there we had, in the previous election, David Peterson saying he was going to bring the federal government to its knees, that he was so

much against free trade. What did he do after he got his majority? He introduced free trade legislation, deregulation legislation, and that is what has caused the anarchy in the trucking industry. That is what has caused the problem.

Where was the member then, who is so critical now? He was there with his little American flag, waving all the American trucks into Canada. That is where he was, at the border.

We pointed out over and over again, as did the Ontario Trucking Association and the industry, that there would be major problems, that if you deregulated you had to make sure the Americans were deregulating. We know that the major concern now of the Ontario Trucking Association and of the industry is the fact that we are not on a level playing field. That is why my ministry, not the previous Liberal government, has started an important study to find out exactly what the facts are concerning the competition with our friends in the United States. I have not seen the member from Windsor even crossing the bridge to talk to some of his counterparts in Michigan to say, "If we're going to have your American trucks with access to our roads, we want reciprocity with you." I can tell the member that I, as a minister, will be doing that and I will be doing that not just with Michigan, which he is neighbour of, but also with New York state and all the other states.

I have had representations from many groups expressing anxiety about the public sharing the road with larger vehicles. I happen to take these concerns seriously, the automobile associations and the various other groups that have come forward. I recognize that there is a technical report which he refers to on Bill 96. Where was his government sending the report out to have public input on the report, an analysis of the report so that people would see exactly what the research was and satisfy themselves that if this was a good idea then we should proceed.

1810

Specifically, if we look at the issues of that report, it did not deal with driver behaviour, it did not deal with the very vital area of truck driver or other driver education. The report does not deal with the infrastructure of Ontario roads. Maybe there are certain roads where certain types of trucks are safe and other types of roads where other types of trucks are safe.

One of the first things I did after being sworn into office as the Minister of Transportation was to tell my staff that we are preparing a major paper on highway safety, that this major paper will have widespread circulation and input and that we will be developing safety programs that will guarantee that people are safer on our highways, not the kind of thing—

The Deputy Speaker: The time has expired.

MINIMUM WAGE

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 33(b), the member for Mississauga North has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question

given by the Minister of Labour concerning the minimum wage. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter and the minister may reply for up to five minutes.

Mr Offer: I do not know that I will be using all the time available to me. The premise of my question was based on two very specific promises made by the now government of Ontario. First, in *An Agenda for People*, it was stated very clearly that over four years they would increase the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage. This particular promise, very clear in its wording, was carried forward in the recent throne speech where it was stated: "Over its five-year mandate, my government will increase the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage."

Mr Speaker, I think you will be aware that this type of promise is very important, not only to the workers of this province but indeed to all the employers and as well to all those who are potentially investing in this province. I think very legitimately they want to know in very clear and concise terms what the New Democratic government is going to be doing with respect to minimum wage for every employee in this province. It was on that basis that I posed the question.

I posed the question because I found it to be unclear in one aspect. What average industrial wage was being referred to in the promises? Clearly, if one is talking about 60% of the average industrial wage as it now is in the province, then we are looking over the next five years at an increase in the minimum wage to approximately \$7.20. However, if one takes into account a very conservative estimation of inflation, in five years' time that 60% figure will be in the area of \$9.14 per hour.

I know the minister is very well aware of the impact of minimum wage across this province and I know the Minister of Labour would want to use this opportunity to be very specific as to what his plans and his government's plans are on a very specific promise.

I have had occasion to look back at the history of the member, and I can see that on 27 November 1989 the member, now the minister, introduced Bill 82, which called for the increase of the minimum wage to, at that point, 65% of the average industrial wage, and that that would be changed each and every year. Not only did the Minister of Labour introduce that bill, but he introduced a further bill, Bill 156, on 13 June 1988, calling for the same type of legislation. That particular bill was fully debated in this Legislature.

I believe it is important for the workers, for employers and for potential investors of this province to know the position of the NDP government. Is it that the minimum wage for the workers of this province will be 60% of the average industrial wage as it now is, being \$7.20, or will it be more in the area of \$9 or \$10, depending upon the rate of inflation? The people have a right to know, and as a result as I posed this question earlier.

I must express surprise that in the minister's response he was not clear. It was a simple question and I expected, I must say, a very concrete and specific answer. I am dissatisfied with the response tendered earlier by the Minister of

Labour, and it was on that basis that I indicated my dissatisfaction. I have used this time, used the rules of this House, so that now we can ask the Minister of Labour what in fact the position of his party is.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I am a little bit surprised, maybe even slightly hurt, that the member for Mississauga North would ask the question that he did, that he would not have trusted my commitment to 60% of the average wage, which has been very clear in every bill I have moved in this House and in every argument I have made. That he would think I would play games with an issue like this is a little bit hurting.

The member should be aware, very clearly, that over its five-year mandate the government will increase the minimum wage to 60% of the average wage in the province. He should also understand why we are doing it, and I think that should be clear too. Significant benefits will accrue to women since two thirds of the low-wage earners in this province are women. According to the 1987 data—we have no reason to think it has changed very much—20% of workers earning at or near the minimum wage are heads of a household. One third of low-wage workers are over age 24. Low-wage earners will buy everything with the money they get coming in. They will add to the purchasing power in our society. We will be assisting the less well-off in our society: women, workers, heads of households.

We have the Social Assistance Review Committee, which just recently brought in its report and said that one of the real problems in the province of Ontario was that we needed a substantial increase in the minimum wage.

With all of this background, why would the member for Mississauga North think that I would play games with our commitment to an increase in the minimum wage?

Mr Offer: Answer the question.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: Well, I have. I answered in my first answer to the member's question. Our intent is 60%, and if I followed the member's argument that somehow or other we are going to end up with \$7.20 at the end of that four or five years, does the member for Mississauga North realize we would be giving minimum wage increases over the next five years of considerably less than the increases these two governments have given in the last 5 or 10 years? It does not make any sense. Surely the member should have never doubted my commitment and my honesty in terms of our commitment to 60% of the average wage in the province of Ontario. It really is a little bit hard to take that he would think I would come in here and play games with him like that.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 33, the member for Ottawa West has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Financial Institutions concerning automobile insurance. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter, and the minister, in this case the parliamentary assistant, may reply for up to five minutes.

Mr Chiarelli: I asked the Minister of Financial Institutions two very simple questions: One, why will he not confirm that auto insurance rates will be decreased under his plan, and two, will the minister today confirm his government's commitment to eliminate any threshold and extend the right to sue to accident victims?

His answer to the first question said basically to wait for the legislation in the spring.

His answer to the second question I will quote from Instant Hansard. He said, "People are watching this now, banging their foreheads and saying, 'I don't believe this guy. How can he do this?'" After he and his party spent so much time stripping away from innocent victims the right to be compensated, after the Liberals took away from victims the right to use the courts, after they poked their heads out of the back pockets of the insurance industry just long enough to ram their legislation through the Legislature, how dare he?"

Will the minister please say he is going to restore the right to sue? Yes or no. It is very simple.

1820

Yesterday, I asked the question and the minister refused to provide the people of Ontario with any details as to the nature of the NDP's proposed auto insurance legislation. Today I asked the minister to alleviate at least some of the uncertainty which his government has created by giving us a direct answer to the questions which I am asking today. Affordability of auto insurance premiums has always been a major goal of auto insurance reform. The previous government's Bill 68 provided average 0% increases outside of the greater Toronto area and 8% within the greater Toronto area.

As all members here know, there are research officers available to the members. I requested a research report and I am going to quote from it. "I contacted the three largest auto insurance companies in Ontario, Co-operators Insurance Co, Royal Insurance Co and Economical Mutual Insurance Co and asked if those companies were able to comply with the so-called 0% and 8% guidelines." I am quoting from the researcher. "All of the above insurance companies stated that they were able to comply with those guidelines." Would the minister please indicate whether he disagrees with that? Affordability is important. The Premier now refuses to confirm his party's promise that state-run auto insurance will provide lower rates for the Ontario consumer. So today I asked the minister why he will not confirm that auto insurance rates will be decreased under his plan.

My supplementary to the minister said: "In opposition, the NDP was extremely clear about its position on auto insurance. Even in April 1987, his Premier and his adviser, Mel Swart, said, 'We believe that accident victims should retain their right to sue where they think losses exceed benefit levels, nor do we consider it necessary to impose any kind of threshold requirement.' The Premier now refuses to confirm that the NDP's auto insurance legislation will allow all accident victims access to the courts. Will the minister today confirm his

government's commitment to eliminate any threshold and to extend the right to sue to accident victims?"

The minister's position on auto insurance has been very clear. Through a lengthy filibuster, in legislative committee and in this House, he has pleaded and harangued for the right of innocent victims to sue for pain and suffering resulting from automobile accidents. Even after assuming his cabinet position, in a prepared speech on 30 October, he said his public system will give access to courtrooms for injured victims. The minister now refuses to confirm that after he was appointed minister.

In view of the NDP's statement in the speech from the throne that the public remains distrustful of governments and it is the government's job to address that cynicism, I ask the minister: Is he not, in a fundamental way, prostituting his principles and adding to that cynicism by accepting his cabinet position and refusing now to give a commitment for the right of innocent victims to sue for pain and suffering?

The minister is not in the House at the present time to respond; he has his parliamentary assistant here. When we were in government, as a matter of policy, when any of these questions and answers were scheduled for 6 pm because the members were not happy, the ministers were always present. I think the Minister of Financial Institutions is chicken to come in here and answer the questions. I welcome the parliamentary assistant to try to do so.

Mr Lessard: I would like to thank my friend the member for Ottawa West for giving me the opportunity to be here and to respond to this question at 6:20 this evening. I would also like to point out to him what I think is perhaps an abusive procedure that is permitted with respect to asking these types of questions.

After listening to the questions that he did raise and listening to his question being raised this evening, he did provide the answers that the minister had provided to him in response to those questions. The minister did reply with respect to the rates of auto insurance that the member was going to have to wait for the legislation to be introduced. The throne speech did indicate that that legislation was going to be coming in in the springtime. In the

opinion of this government, that is not going to be too long to wait.

With respect to the second question, the right to sue, there was an answer to that question as well. The response to that is that the member is going to have to wait for the legislation in the springtime.

As far as the increase in insurance rates being kept down pursuant to the present plan is concerned, that is not the experience that I am finding, at least in my own riding. People are telling me that insurance rates are going up. It is my submission that the details with respect to the insurance plan were specific enough in the throne speech and that my friend would agree with me that it is the job of this government not to tip its hand to the insurance industry with respect to the plans that are being studied at the present time. In order for those plans to be implemented in a responsible way, there are some discussions and consultations that are going to have to be done in secret. Once the consultation process is complete and the plan is put together, it will be introduced in this House in the springtime.

I listened with respect to the comments on the throne speech by the member for Lawrence, who indicated that he was proud of the record of the government on the SARC report, and that is something that we intend to continue with the implementation of. He had also indicated that there was some problem with respect to the promise about nuclear power and that we should perhaps decide not to have any further nuclear reactors here in the province of Ontario.

Something that we are not going to forget are the ideals that we have always had, the reason that we have been elected and the people who did elect us. We know that we received the support of 37% of the voters in order to form the government here in Ontario and that there are a lot of people who did not elect us to form the government. We have to take into consideration that we are representing all of those people as well. We have to take our time, be responsible and consult with those persons. We are going to do that with respect to auto insurance as well.

The House adjourned at 1830.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
58	2146	1	3	one that requires education of the consumers, of urban people, and we hope to address that problem in the near future.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Tuesday 27 November 1990

Members' statements

Violence against women	2195
Mrs Fawcett	
Family violence	2195
Mrs MacKinnon	
Employment equity	2196
Mr Curling	
Landfill site	2196
Mr J. Wilson	
Clarence Williams	2196
Mr Lessard	
Transit services	2196
Mr Mancini	
Ontario Science Centre	2197
Mr Harnick	

Statements by the ministry

Education of hearing-impaired	2197
Mrs Boyd	
Abortion	2198
Mrs Gigantes	

Responses

Abortion	2198
Mr Phillips	
Education of hearing-impaired	2199
Mr Beer	
Abortion	2199
Mr Eves	
Education of hearing-impaired	2200
Mrs Cunningham	

Oral questions

Agricultural industry	2200
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Cleary	
Waste management	2201
Mrs Sullivan	
Mrs Grier	
Mr McClelland	
Mr Curling	
Protection of in-care residents	2202
Mr Harris	
Mr Rae	
Small business	2203
Mr Harris	
Mr Rae	
Minimum wage	2204
Mr Offer	
Mr Mackenzie	
Agricultural industry	2205

Mr Villeneuve	
Mr Buchanan	
Retail store hours	2205
Mr White	
Mr Farnan	
Automobile insurance	2205
Mr Chiarelli	
Mr Kormos	
Mr Runciman	
Unemployment insurance	2207
Mr Martin	
Mr Mackenzie	
Shipbuilding industry	2207
Mr Bradley	
Mr Philip	
Hospital financing	2207
Mr Eves	
Mrs Gigantes	

Petitions

Elevators	2208
Mr Harris	
Sandwich West woodlot	2209
Mr Dadamo	
Police services	2209
Mrs Mathysen	

First reading

Oratory of Saint Philip Neri-Toronto Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr19	2209
Mr Mammolitti	
Agreed to	2209

Throne speech debate

Resuming the adjourned debate	2209
Mr Curling	2209
Mr Harris	2209
Mr B. Murdoch	2210
Ms Haeck	2211
Mr Wood	2211
Mr Mahoney	2212
Mrs Mathysen	2214
Mrs Cunningham	2214
Mr J. Wilson	2215
Mr Ferguson	2218
Mr Hope	2218
Mr Sutherland	2218
Mr Frankford	2219
Mr Henderson	2220
Mr Beer	2220
Mr Elston	2220
Mr Cordiano	2221
Mr Hansen	2223

Mr Bisson	2223	Other business	
Mr McLean	2224		
Mr White	2226	Annual report, Office of the Provincial Auditor . . .	2195
Mr Klopp	2226	The Speaker	
Mr Martin	2227	Closed-captioning	2195
Mrs McLeod	2228	The Speaker	
Mr B. Ward	2230	Visitor	2197
Mrs Y. O'Neill	2231	Mr Bisson	
Ms Haslam	2231	Visitor	2206
Adjourned	2232	The Speaker	
Adjournment debate		Notices of dissatisfaction	2208
Trucking industry	2232	Mr Offer	
Mr Mancini		Mr Chiarelli	
Mr Philip		Notices of dissatisfaction	2214
Minimum wage	2233	The Acting Speaker	
Mr Offer		Adjournment	2235
Mr Mackenzie			
Automobile insurance	2234	Lists of members	
Mr Chiarelli			
Mr Lessard		Members and their responsibilities	2236

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 27 novembre 1990

Réponse

Education des élèves sourds et malentendants	2199
M. Beer	



61 1990

61 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 28 November 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 28 novembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 28 November 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

Mr Cleary: Ontario farmers want to know where the NDP government stands on the issue of stable funding for farm organizations and mandatory membership in farm organizations. Earlier this week, the Minister of Agriculture and Food told the Ontario Federation of Agriculture one thing, he told reporters a second thing and he told this House a third thing.

The minister is being as slippery as a newborn calf.

First, he told the Ontario Federation of Agriculture that he supports stable funding for farm organizations. Then he told reporters that he does not support the Ontario Federation of Agriculture as the farm community's lone lobbying voice.

Yesterday, the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry asked the minister to explain his position, but he did not have much luck. All the minister would say is, "We intend to pursue the concept of giving farmers a voice."

As the outgoing president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture described the new minister, "He's 100% in favour of having children, but he wants to remain a virgin."

The minister told the House yesterday, "Farmers have been trying over the years to get their act together...." The farmers of this province do have their act together. It is the NDP government that does not have its act together.

I urge the minister to clarify this government's position for the farmers of Ontario.

DURHAM ART GALLERY

Mr B. Murdoch: I would like to bring the plight of the Durham Art Gallery to the attention of the Minister of Culture and Communications and the Legislature in general.

This small art gallery is one of the finest of its size anywhere and we in Grey are very proud of it. Operating from the basement of the public library, it has managed to produce a minimum of 12 shows per year, exhibiting national and international work and showcasing our local artists and crafts people. Unfortunately, the gallery is trying to do this as well as educating young people and conducting student tours in an economically depressed rural area with no corporate support.

Now they face a crisis. The library which has donated the space has asked them to leave. Operating costs are up and donations are down. The gallery has not been able to afford an exhibit since the beginning of October and is relying on fund-raising in the form of bake and craft sales and a silent auction to pay off its minor debt.

The membership and general public have been very supportive, but they are not wealthy. Everyone is sympathetic, yet no one can help.

The speech from the throne allotted further funding to the Ontario Arts Council. It is my hope that the minister, who is aware of the situation, could help by granting special status to this very important culture resource in my community.

RIDING OF KITCHENER-WILMOT

Mr Cooper: First, Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your election. Next, I would like to say a few words about my predecessor, John Sweeney, the former Minister of Community and Social Services and later the Minister of Housing and of Municipal Affairs.

After representing the constituents of Kitchener-Wilmot in the Ontario Legislature for 15 years, Mr Sweeney chose not to run in the last provincial election. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the hard work and commitment he put into representing the constituents of Kitchener-Wilmot, and I offer to him my best wishes for the future.

Finally, I want to tell the members about firefighters Paul Bagnarol and Robert Innanen of the Kitchener Fire Department. On 27 December 1988 firefighters Bagnarol and Innanen risked their own lives in an attempt to save the life of Captain Charles Kieswetter, who was trapped and overcome by heat and smoke in a house fire.

Firefighters Bagnarol and Innanen were among the recipients of the 1990 Ontario Medal for Firefighters' Bravery. I ask all members of the House to join me in recognizing and congratulating these two courageous men.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I find a very recent survey taken by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation distressing. Its results indicate that technical shops are closing across this province one by one, because properly trained staff cannot be found in the specialties of automotive, carpentry, welding, graphic arts, drafting and electronics.

The very necessary renewal of technological education throughout this province demands a high level of consultation with representatives of labour, business and industry and the colleges of applied arts and technology. It demands focused in-service training and major input from the faculties of education and indeed the technical teachers themselves.

Acting directly upon the Premier's Council's report *Competing in the New Global Economy*, the previous government began such a task by beginning broad and serious discussions and by offering incentives to school boards in the categories of construction, manufacturing, service and transportation.

I, along with the OSSTF, urge this government to plan co-operatively with and fund adequately the faculties of education, as we rescue technical education and restore

stability to the supply of skilled labour that is this province's such great need.

Ministerial guidelines must be developed, and it is essential that school boards across this province be given every assistance possible in this basic area of study, and thus ensure that our young people, our most precious resource, will be technically literate as they enter the world of work in this era of global competitiveness. Ontario's need for skilled labour hangs in the balance.

SKYDOME

Mr Stockwell: On 11 October 1990 the Treasurer made a public statement revealing the financial state of the SkyDome. On 24 October 1990 the Treasurer appointed a negotiating team to negotiate a new agreement between the consortium members and the province of Ontario.

The problem that the taxpayers have with all of this is that they presently have no idea if the existing agreement is fair and just, due to the fact that documentation regarding the profit-and-loss-sharing agreements, which appear to bind the taxpayers to absorb the losses, is not public information. Taking this into consideration, the taxpayers will not be able to assess the success or failure of the committee struck, for the simple reason that no one knows what the original agreement entailed.

There must be a yardstick to measure any new agreements against, and that yardstick is some kind of method to compare the profitability of the private companies and the debt servicing of this government. Maybe the most important issue is how much money the private companies are profiting and how much money the provincial government is in fact losing.

I strongly urge that the very first item of business by the standing committee on public accounts be to direct the Provincial Auditor to do a total review of the costs incurred during the construction of the SkyDome and issue a full public report.

What I would like to know from this government is what happened to the openness in government theme it ran on. Let us start this session by levelling with the taxpayers of Ontario, informing them just how much the private corporations are taking to their banks as a result of doing business at the SkyDome, and just how much money the government is shorting us all.

1340

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr Frankford: Canadian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War is an affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, the winner of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize. There are more than 7,500 physician members, approximately 20% of all Canadian doctors.

As 1990 draws to a close, the world is on the threshold of either putting an abrupt halt to the engine which drives the arms race, or it is opening the door, which is already ajar in several countries, to the rampant spread of new nuclear weapons.

In January 1991 the United Nations Partial Test Ban Amending Conference will decide if a comprehensive test

ban is achievable. In spite of the end of the cold war, underground testing under the guise of modernization allows the nuclear arms race to continue and, in the name of national security, pollutes our environment with radiation.

With on-site inspection possible, verification to prevent cheating is no longer an issue. Although previous American and British governments supported a comprehensive test ban, currently these two countries alone plan to veto an initiative endorsed by the rest of the world.

Failure to amend the partial test ban will put in jeopardy the non-proliferation treaty which will expire in 1995 and which was designed to limit the spread of nuclear weapons capability.

As a supporter of Canadian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, I urge my fellow members of this House to demand that our Prime Minister fulfil Canada's traditional role as a peacemaker and speak out in support of a comprehensive test ban.

ELLIOT LAKE

Mr Brown: Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your election to this House and your elevation to this very important post, and on a fine dinner, I might add.

Today, I would also like to thank the new government for sending the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy to Elliot Lake on a kamikaze mission.

As most members should know, Elliot Lake is experiencing the worst of economic times. In August, 60% of the primary workforce was laid off—60% of the workforce.

Did the parliamentary assistant arrive to confirm commitments made by the Liberal government? Did he confirm the \$10-million diversification fund? Did he confirm the building of a direct road to Blind River? Did he announce a fire college? Did he announce a French-language college? Did he announce a seniors' campus? Did he announce that Ontario Hydro will purchase all its uranium in Elliot Lake? Did he arrive with any good news?

No, he arrived to confirm that his government does not believe in the environmental assessment process. He arrived to confirm that his government had bravely and courageously taken giant steps to prejudice that process which will review Hydro's 25-year plan. He arrived to ensure the people of Elliot Lake oblivion.

These same people may be excused for thinking that Brian Charlton was Brian Mulroney.

ZEBRA MUSSELS

Mr McLean: My statement is for the Minister of Natural Resources. It concerns a tiny shellfish that has been causing serious problems in European waters for years and is now thriving in the waters of Ontario.

The minister is no doubt aware that the zebra mussel was first introduced into Lake St Clair in 1988 by a ship discharging ballast water that was originally picked up in a European port. Zebra mussels damage boats and fishing equipment. Large concentrations of zebra mussels have been found attached inside industrial power plant and industrial water intake pipes. They reduce the amount of

food available to the young of many fish species and they decrease the survival rate of fish eggs.

The time has come to introduce a program aimed at ridding our waters of the zebra mussel. It must be done now, because experts tell me it would be easier to prevent or control the initial attachment of the larvae than to try to dislodge the zebra mussel once it is established. Develop a program now before tourism, our fisheries and our water systems and electrical generating plants are damaged beyond repair.

Why has the minister not made a statement in this Legislature? What does he intend to do? Does he not think that this is one of the important items in Ontario?

CHARLES TATHAM

Mr Sutherland: Mr Speaker, I too want to congratulate you on your re-election to this House and your election as the Speaker. I was remiss in not doing that in my previous time speaking.

I want to make a statement today about the previous member for the riding of Oxford, Charlie Tatham. As many of the members know, Charlie was the member from 1987 until the recent election. In talking with many members of this House, I know that Charlie was a very well-liked individual and highly respected by members of all three parties in this House.

Mr Tatham started his career of public service many years ago. He was the mayor of Woodstock in 1957. He continued to be active in municipal politics for many years, right until the time of his election to this House. He served in many different areas within the riding of Oxford. He was also the warden for the county of Oxford at one time.

As a member of this House, he was also very active. He was the Premier's representative on the Ontario-Quebec high-speed rail committee. He also chaired a committee that toured around the province and looked at the restructuring of county governments, as Mr Tatham was very active when Oxford county restructured its government in 1975.

I just want to make mention of him and, on behalf of the people of Oxford, thank Mr Tatham for his many years of public service both to the people of Oxford and to this province.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

RENT REGULATION

Hon Mr Cooke: Today we begin a new era in providing real protection for tenants in this province.

Since 1975, Ontario has coped with several different rent review systems. Each has had little commitment to protecting tenants. The current Residential Rent Regulation Act has been condemned by both tenants and landlords as being too complex and too costly.

More important, the system has failed in protecting tenants from high rent increases. During the past three years, more than 330,000 tenant families have faced increases above the rent review guideline. In some cases, tenants have been required to pay rent increases of more than 100%. For many, this has been tantamount to ordering

them to leave their homes. Clearly, the existing process must be replaced with rent control that provides tenants with protection from high rent increases.

As well, we have to devise a process that is much less complex and intimidating. It must be easier for people to understand and use and simpler to administer than the current process.

It is the intention of this government to develop such a system through extensive consultation with tenants, landlords and other interested parties. In the meantime, we are introducing a two-year moratorium to protect tenants from high rent increases. It will apply to rent increases taking effect from 1 October 1990, the day this government took office, and will continue until the new rent control legislation is in place.

I am tabling the necessary amendments to the Residential Rent Regulation Act today to put in place those measures required to implement the moratorium. I would note, however, that most of the Residential Rent Regulation Act and its associated regulations will remain unchanged by this amending legislation. For example, the current administrative and hearings procedure will continue, as will tenants' rights to seek rent rebates. As well, the rent registry and the Residential Rental Standards Board will remain in place.

Under the moratorium, the majority of rent increases will be limited to the amount of the annual guideline set by the ministry each year. Members will recall that this guideline is based on the average cost increases that a typical landlord would experience in operating a well-managed rental property.

1350

In 1990 the guideline is 4.6% and in 1991 it is 5.4%. Landlords will be allowed to seek moderate rent increases above these guidelines to help cover some operating increases which are clearly beyond their control. These would be significant increases in municipal taxes, heating, hydro, water, cable and insurance and higher costs arising from changes in interest rates when existing mortgages—and I emphasize existing mortgages—are renewed.

Under the moratorium, tenants will no longer be required to pay rent increases to finance luxury renovations or the flipping of apartment buildings. As well, tenants will not face rent increases arising from capital expenditures. In addition, tenants will not have to pay previously approved rent increases that were to be phased in over a period of years. The proposed legislation cancels all phased-in rent increases taking effect in a building on 1 October 1990 or later. Once the moratorium legislation is passed, landlords will be required to repay tenants any amounts of moneys owed since 1 October 1990.

The moratorium will not apply to rent increases that were effective before 1 October 1990. In allowing these applications to continue under the old rules, we are conceding that we cannot retroactively correct all the inequities of the past legislation. However, there is a possibility that these older applications may result in some tenants owing retroactive rent increases to their landlords. If this proves to be the case, we intend to protect tenants by instituting measures to allow them to repay retroactive rent

increases over a one-year period instead of the current situation where they have to pay them up front.

The moratorium legislation will enable us to protect tenants over the two-year period while we turn our full attention to public consultations on a permanent rent control system. This consultation process, along with the development and passage of permanent legislation, will be completed within the two-year period. We encourage everyone in Ontario to take part in the consultations across the province on this important issue.

As well, I would like to indicate to the members of the House that I hope they will play an active role in the consultation process. It is my intention to involve them fully in the development of the new rent control legislation. We face a considerable challenge in the months ahead and I look forward to receiving the advice and assistance of all my colleagues.

RESPONSES

RENT REGULATION

Ms Poole: I would like to respond to the statement by the Minister of Housing. If the minister thinks he is going to appease anyone by his statement today, he is sadly mistaken. We had expected at the very least that this minister would have the courage to announce a specific outline of his government's rent control policy.

We in the opposition must ask a question: Why has the minister delayed introducing his permanent rent control policy? Could it be that he has finally realized that the rent control policy they promised in *An Agenda for People* is simply unworkable? Could it be that the minister has finally seen the light that there is no simple solution to the myriad of complexities in the rental housing market?

The minister has quite a dilemma. When he was opposition critic, he had a very simple proposal to solve the rental problems in the province, and the operative word is "simple." His solution was to have one guideline rent increase per year with no exemptions, and in fact the NDP, in the election campaign, adopted the minister's proposal. The Premier himself—the one right across the way with the glowing halo—promised: "New Democrats would bring in rent control. That means one increase a year based on inflation. There would be no extra bonuses to landlords for capital or financing costs."

Why could the minister and the Premier not fulfil this promise and bring in permanent legislation today? There are really only two reasons: Either their plan was flawed, their policy too simplistic to be workable—in other words, they had not done their homework and their research—or, on the other hand, they knew at the time that their plan was unworkable and unrealistic but they figured: "Hey, it'll win us a few votes. We'll get the tenants on our side."

What a choice. They had to admit they were either opportunistic or incompetent. They were not options for this new, truthful government of integrity. Instead, they chose the option to announce a freeze and give people a chance to forget what the NDP's policy on rent control really was.

Has the minister realized the ramifications of the freeze he has announced? Does he actually believe there will be

any capital work done in any building in the province when landlords have no idea how they can pay for the work? Has he considered what will happen to work that is half-completed?

I have here a memorandum from a landlord who faxed me this morning saying: "We are in the process of refurbishing 109 Jameson. If the NDP legislation is retroactive, we will stop the work in its present condition, as we will lose too much money by completing it."

What is the minister going to do about the situation? The tenants cannot live in a state of frozen chaos and construction for the next two years while he makes up his mind. Has the minister considered what uncertainty this freeze has created and what it will do to the rental housing market? Does he have any plan for dealing with the bankruptcies and the insolvencies that are inevitable? Does he realize that the uncertainty may force the banks to become the province's largest landlord? I ask the minister, do bankers fix toilets? I predict we are going to have to find out.

At first glance, this seems to be great news for the tenants of the province, rents frozen for the next two years. However, this irresponsible act will become a nightmare for tenants as their aging apartment buildings start to crumble around them. The minister has taken the first step towards his new title, Minister of Slums.

Mr Curling: I want to ask the minister, where is the fairness in this? He said he wanted to be fair to landlords and tenants. It seems to me it is a one-sided patchwork, broad statement here. I ask the minister to ask his colleague the Treasurer; he sat on Bill 51 and he realizes that the contribution of landlords and tenants on that bill was just tremendous. We have never seen such consultation. Now he is saying he is going to go out for consultation. I say to the minister that he has no policy. It is a patchwork situation that he has here. He complained that we had a patchwork. I say to him to bring his housing policy out and then we will see whether he has rent control or rent review. He should be fair to both landlords and tenants.

Mr Tilson: I would like to respond to the minister's statement. I must confess I am a new member to the Legislature. This morning I found a press release by the Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario crossing my desk. I found an advertisement by the ministry on where it is going with respect to housing. All of this came out before the minister had even released his statement. To me, it is clearly a ministry that is out of control.

I will say that I thought the Liberals were in bad shape with their policy. This policy is an absolute disaster. It is unbelievable where we are going with this proposal by the minister. Already we are in the throes of a recession. We are going to have to absorb a flight of capital, bankruptcies and unemployment in the construction trades. There is certainly not going to be any incentive to maintain our existing rental stock and, over time, units will be lost due to deterioration. Small landlords are going to remove their units from the market, thereby accelerating the vacancy problem. If tenants think things are bad now, wait until

they cannot find anything, wait until they are living in slums.

The rental housing industry has indicated that \$1.68 billion in planned renovation work by 1992 will not proceed, resulting in the loss of 52,000 person-years of employment. The minister is not clear in his statement as to where he is going in that direction. There is certainly not going to be any private sector investment in rental housing. The province will have to build every new unit because no one else is going to do it, something the provincial Treasury, facing a \$2.5-billion deficit, cannot afford.

If they proceed with the 20,000 units a year that they promised during the election, it is going to cost \$380 million in operating subsidies over two years, and this does not even include the capital costs. The Liberals spent \$3 billion to construct only 30,000 units.

This policy will do nothing to help the 360,000 tenant households that already spend in excess of 30% of their income in rent. By the time this two-year moratorium has run its course, I think landlords will be broke, there will be tenants without accommodation and many others will be living in slum accommodation.

1400

Mr Stockwell: I have read *An Agenda for People* a number of times. I am not certain why it was written, at this point in time. It is a break-a-promise-a-day routine around this House from now on. Joe DiMaggio's consecutive hitting streak is in jeopardy with this particular government; 56 days seems very likely. Where in *An Agenda for People* did they mention a moratorium? Where did they mention consultation—two years of consultation?

They mentioned bonusing. Yes, they did, they mentioned bonusing. They were very clear: There will be no bonusing. They summarized their approach to rent controls with, "It's simple, it's fair and it avoids bureaucracy."

I do not know what happened between the date that this was printed and the date the announcement was made, but either they have forgotten quite a bit or it really was not their intention to implement this and it was simply used as a vote-getting promise and now that they are in government today they would simply choose to forget the *Agenda for People*, because quite conceivably, quite apparently, the people can simply choose to forget this.

Mr Grandmaitre: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: If the Minister of Housing thinks his announcement or his statement is so important, he should have had it printed in French, in the two official languages of this province.

Hon Mr Cooke: If I could explain to the member, and I certainly apologize for the fact that the statement is not available at this particular moment in both languages, the fact of the matter is that this statement was scheduled for tomorrow. The Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario put out a press release this morning that does not adequately represent the position that the government has announced today. To avoid confusion for landlords and tenants across this province, we thought it was appropriate that the statement be made now, today, to avoid that con-

fusion for landlords and tenants. As a result, the statement was not ready in both languages. It will be ready very shortly, but I sincerely apologize for that fact now.

The Speaker: I appreciate the member's point of order and would draw members' attention to the fact that while it has been a recent practice of this assembly to present ministers' statements in both of our official languages, it is not a requirement, but it is normally extended as a courtesy. I do appreciate the point you raised.

VISITOR

The Speaker: I wish at the same time to recognize, and members may wish to welcome, a former member of this assembly who is seated in the members' gallery, René Fontaine from Cochrane North.

Before beginning oral questions I wish to commend the members, who have been most diligent in directing both their questions and their replies to the Speaker. It is most helpful as we conduct our business in an orderly way and I appreciate the efforts that have been extended both yesterday and again today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

LAYOFFS

Mr Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Labour having to do with the startling and continuing escalation in the rate of layoffs. The honourable minister is no doubt as familiar as anyone with the statistics in this regard, but when his own ministry indicated that there would be 5,000 more layoffs in the province in November, it certainly is a clear point in which the government has to express to this House and the people of the province, not just those laid off or facing it, specifically what its programs will be.

I would simply ask the minister if he can indicate to the House clearly what he is going to do which is going to begin within the next very short period of time and which should be under way now to alleviate the concern that is felt by all members of this House in response to the needs of the people in our constituencies.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: The member has raised an issue that is probably of the most concern to members of this government. We had, up until the end of October, a 77% increase in permanent layoffs and closures in Ontario. We are going to address this with labour adjustment and retraining programs, with changes that allow for longer notice periods. We are in the process right now of working on the various steps we will be taking to try to alleviate the problem.

Mr Nixon: The honourable minister has had his responsibility for eight weeks, not a long period of time, but about halfway through that period the Premier and himself and his colleagues announced that there would be a wage protection fund retroactive to 1 October, the day this government took office, and that the people who were laid off because of bankruptcies therefore would be protected. It was not clear, and certainly was not made clear in the speech from the throne, whether this would include pay only or severance, notice, vacation; when in

fact it would be in place; how it would be funded, and some indication of what the cost might be in view of the layoffs and bankruptcy rates, which have gone up 80% year over year.

Now, the statement was made by the Premier at the time he was approving the move of Victor Rice and Varsity Corp out of the province to Buffalo. It was attempting to soften the blow. But surely the time has come when this government should bring forward specific plans and, I would suggest, legislation. I would ask the honourable minister when he and his colleagues are going to present such legislation to this House.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I can assure the member that the wage protection part of our package—and that is only part of the package to deal with the layoffs that we have in Ontario today—will be before this House very shortly. We are consulting with a number of parties now. There is a fair difference in the cost of such a program. The initial statement listed only wages and vacation pay. We have to take a look at severance and termination and what we can put into the package and how we can fund it or finance it, and that is what we are in the process of working on right now.

Mr Nixon: I have some sympathy for the honourable member, who used to be so aggressive on this side of the House, calling for action, if not immediately, then probably yesterday. I am not so sure I like the new persona of the honourable member. While I was prepared to be somewhat critical of him, it was not on a basis of inaction. Unfortunately, he seems to have fallen into the grip of the molasses-in-January principle that the Premier has imposed on all of his colleagues.

I would like to ask the honourable minister, since he has the main responsibility in this regard, for example, how the announcement of the \$700-million special fund in the speech from the throne is going to be allocated, since the Treasurer indicated that it would not be any significant call on the consolidated revenue fund until the next budgetary period. Then how are we supposed to talk to the people in our constituencies to say that help is on the way in a reasonable period of time? Would he not feel that his own response is similar when he says that they are having a little trouble remembering whether their original statement had to do with just pay or whether it had to do with severance and notice and vacation?

Surely he can inform the House now, since the Minister of Housing is presenting special legislation today, that we are going to see this legislation and have ample time to consider it so that when the throne debate is completed in a few days, we can go on to the consideration of this immediately important initiative.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I think the leader of the official opposition knows that the \$700 million he refers to is capital projects, part of a package to deal with the unemployment in the province, and there will be announcements on that very shortly.

The part of the package that I am working on as Minister of Labour—the labour adjustments, the severance, the notice, the justification, the wage protection plan—is something that the leader of the official opposition knows I

was raising in this House for almost five years and got absolutely nowhere with. I want the leader of the official opposition to know that in the two months I have had charge of my ministry, we are probably closer to bringing in all of the components of that package than we got in five years of going after the Liberals.

1410

DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED

Mrs McLeod: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. The minister may not be fully aware of the anxiety and the concern that exists across this province because of her decision to freeze plans to move developmentally disabled people out of institutions and into the community.

Will the minister please tell us why she has placed a freeze on these plans for deinstitutionalization and particularly why this freeze on transfers applies only to moves out of government-operated institutions while the movement of residents out of privately owned nursing homes can continue?

Hon Mrs Akande: Actually, there has not been a freeze placed on that movement; there has been a temporary hold placed on that. The reason for such a move is simply to give us an opportunity to provide a better process in which everyone is involved and is satisfied. There were some concerns, even expressed by those people whose families were to be moved, about the process that was in use, so this is an attempt to provide a better process.

Mrs McLeod: I would like to remind the minister that the people who are most directly affected by this decision are people who will indeed be trapped in institutions if there is not a will on the part of this government to move forward with the plans for deinstitutionalization. I would also remind the minister that members of her caucus in the past have been critical of the previous government for not moving quickly enough. Her response on a matter of process leads me to the supplementary question.

We know there was no consultation with the Ontario Association for Community Living prior to the minister's decision to freeze the program being made. We know that other advocacy groups such as the Advocacy Resource Centre for the Handicapped and People First were not even aware of her decision until we contacted them because we were concerned.

We do know that the union wanted exactly the freeze that the minister has imposed. In fact, we have a copy of a letter to the Ontario Association for Community Living with the first formal communication regarding this temporary hold dated 15 November.

We also have a copy of a message to union members that was posted at the Oxford Regional Centre and, if I may ask the indulgence of the House for one moment, I think it is important that they be aware of this.

The message states:

"I was informed in a phone call received at 5:15 pm from head office that effective immediately, the multi-year plan has been put on hold.

"Only those residents who already have their bags packed will leave the facility.

"Fred Upshaw, president of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, in a meeting with the Minister of Community and Social Services and the fight at local levels were instrumental in achieving the hold on this plan."

That message is dated 6 November. Will the minister please tell this House and concerned people around this province why she did not consult with advocacy groups or individuals or families before stepping in and why, as a member of a government committed to consultation, she would not have taken the time for this very basic communication?

Hon Mrs Akande: I am happy to answer that question. As a matter of fact, I have been in contact by telephone with Mr Zwerver, who is the Canadian president or chairperson of the Ontario Association for Community Living, and we have discussed this hold. This government remains committed to community-based services.

The intent of the temporary hold is simply to provide an opportunity to look at the process. We are not discussing whether, we are discussing how to include all people, including the groups that the member mentions in a discussion of that process. I might state, however, that I am not responsible for the communication that is written by others. I simply accept responsibility for communications which bear my signature.

Mrs McLeod: I am pleased to hear of the minister's continued sense of commitment. I confess that I was somewhat surprised by the communication that was sent to all members of the House. While I appreciated the information, my surprise rested in the fact that the information provided by the ministry was clearly supportive continuing the program and really failed to offer any more reason for this temporary hold in exactly the terms the minister has used today, which is in some way to look at a more effective process.

This plan was developed over a long period of time. The process was very clearly in place. It was proceeding in a way which I understand had been considered quite satisfactory by all the groups and individuals that have been involved. But I do want to say that I do not question the minister's concern. I know that she has expressed outside this House her own belief in the importance of having disabled people become part of the mainstream of our community.

I do want to give the minister an opportunity to reassure people across the province who are concerned. Will the minister please tell us what comes next for people in government-operated institutions? Will she make a commitment to moving developmentally disabled individuals out of the government-operated institutions, and when will this temporary hold be lifted?

Hon Mrs Akande: I am very glad that the member recognizes this government's commitment to community-based services and certainly I share that with her.

We are indeed anxious to move people out of large institutions into their communities. We will do so with the support of all those involved. While the member speaks

highly of the process which her government implemented, I am afraid that I have received some questions about it and therefore felt it was my responsibility to assume a more thorough study. So we have done. May I assure the member that we will indeed bring this to the House as soon as we have done that as quickly as possible.

Mr Jackson: My question is to the Premier and it as well has to do with the multi-year plan that has just been referenced in the previous question. I would like to furnish the Premier with a copy of the memo previously referred to. I have a copy which I would like him to look at.

I also wish to direct his attention to the fact that on 20 November he made a statement through the Lieutenant Governor in this House. He gave two brief statements in support of community living. I will quote from the throne speech:

"We will work towards our communities becoming supportive environments where all people, including those who are vulnerable, can meet their full potential, participate in community life and make their contribution to society. In doing so, we recognize that saying yes to their concerns will mean saying no to others whose claims are presented more loudly."

I would like the Premier to address the House on the fact that his Minister of Community and Social Services undertook a private meeting with the head of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union and apparently, on the face of the memo, arrived at a decision and a deal to put the multi-year plan on hold. There was not the consultation nor the exchange of information with the key partners in this act.

I would like the Premier to advise this House whether he was aware that this special deal had been made as he was drafting the throne speech some two weeks later.

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, I thank the member for the question. Let me say to the member that I am not aware of any such deal of any kind. I do not think that is a fair characterization of what has happened.

If I can refer the member to it, I am also in receipt, as is the whole House, of a jury verdict in the Cedar Glen inquest. The member will recall that the circumstances there were of an ex-psychiatric patient from the Queen Street Mental Health Centre who was discharged to the Cedar Glen boarding home on 1 May 1985 and was admitted to Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital on 1 November 1987 after an altercation with another resident of the home resulting in a fall. Mr Kendall was admitted dirty, malnourished, overmedicated, disoriented due to a drug reaction and developing pneumonia.

I just want to say to the member, the bottom line for all of us has to be to ensure that the quality of community support is there for everyone who is a resident of a provincial institution who is being admitted into the community. That has to be the bottom line. If I can say so, we dealt with this question for the past 15 or 16 years in this House, which is when the process of deinstitutionalization began.

As I understand it, what the minister is saying, and I think it is a fair comment, is to make sure that the quality of community care is there and let's make sure that enough

is being done to protect the interests of the residents, of people who are either in a psychiatric institution who are being discharged or who are in a residential facility for the developmentally handicapped who are being discharged.

It seems to me that we are entitled to say that we have a responsibility as a government to ensure that the community support is there. But let me say to the member that the creation of caring communities in the communities of this province is a priority for our government and is something to which we are committed as a government and to which I am committed as Premier of the province.

1420

Mr Jackson: The question to the Premier was for him to conduct an inquiry into the relationship he has within his own cabinet in terms of consultation. The hallmarks that he had for his position politically when he sat on this side of the House we now expect him to be consistent and continue while he is on that side of the House.

I refresh the Premier with his positions: that he would be open and honest and that he would be forthcoming and consultative with the key players. What I raised and brought to the Premier's attention was the fact that the head of one of the most powerful unions of this province had a private audience with the minister responsible. There were no vulnerable adults represented in that room.

The fact is that the Premier was not aware that these kinds of arrangements were being made, and I will continue to refer to them as a deal because, as the minister admitted herself, her contact with the association directly only occurred this week.

I would ask the Premier again: Are these the kinds of activities that he condones for his cabinet ministers with respect to consultation, particularly after he told the people of Ontario the importance he placed on ensuring that vulnerable adults had access to the decision-making powers of this province?

Hon Mr Rae: The member has asked me to repeat or to state what my commitments are and what our commitments are as a government, and I will say this to the member: I expect the Ontario Association for Community Living to be consulted. I expect those representing vulnerable people to be consulted. I expect those who have experience in the community to be consulted. I expect ARCH to be consulted. I expect advocates on behalf of the disabled to be consulted. I expect the people who are working in institutions to be consulted. I expect everyone to be consulted, and that is what will be done.

I expect a decision from this government that is going to ensure that every resident, everyone who is physically disabled or who is vulnerable, has an appropriate level of care and that, wherever possible, that care is provided in the community. That is the policy of our government. That is what we are committed to and that is exactly what the minister is committed to as well.

Mr Jackson: We agree with the standard the Premier just set out and we are gravely concerned at the minister's actions, which appear to have contradicted the very standard the Premier has set.

What I have handed over to the Premier, thanks to the page, is an announcement that his own minister made subsequent to her arrangement or deal with the Ontario Public Service Employees Union to put a hold on the program.

On 6 November she announced \$168,000 funding from her ministry for the Oakville Association for the Mentally Retarded. It got a considerable amount of press coverage in the local community. Why I have sent the Premier that press release is so he is aware that the deal had been made and she was announcing plans for expansion.

What I am now going to advise the Premier is that three days later her ministry advised the association not only that their funds would not be forthcoming but also—I am sorry to be technical—that condition 6 as established for any continuance of this program by the government was that necessary staff be hired or be in the process of being hired to care for these deinstitutionalized vulnerable adults. The fact is that the Ministry of Community and Social Services advised the local association to pull the ad notice for hiring of those staff after it had played in the local media for three days.

I again reiterate that these are serious matters. It could be a simple breakdown of communications, but I fear more directly that there is more at play here. I ask the Premier again if he will investigate the actions of his minister, not only with respect to her private meetings with the union but also with respect to her convoluted approach to the association in Oakville in terms of its funding commitment and then withdrawal of support.

Where is the commitment? The Premier will only determine that if he is prepared to investigate the minister's actions.

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the information that I have received from the member. Obviously, now that he has raised it with me, I will review it with the minister. That is a perfectly reasonable request for him to make and it is something which will obviously be discussed.

But let me just say to the member once again that, ever since Walter Williston's report in 1974, this House has been debating and dealing with the question of deinstitutionalization and that the concern has been expressed by a number of us on a number of occasions. I can well recall, going back to the early 1980s, when the then Leader of the Opposition, who went on to become Premier, Mr Peterson, launched a campaign on behalf of the Liberal Party at that time with respect to the multi-year plans, expressing concern about the impact that those plans would have on residents and the impact that they would have on a number of institutions.

We are going to continue to discuss this question. I hope we can do it in a balanced way. What I want to say to the member is this: We are committed to providing the highest possible standard of care. The news yesterday with respect to the Brantwood situation was profoundly disturbing to me, as I am sure it is to all members. The reports that we have had from inquests over the years with respect to what has happened in private boarding homes and in unregulated institutions is of profound concern to me, as I am sure it is to the member. It is of profound concern to

this government. We do not have a monopoly on this concern; we share it with all the members.

We are going to do what we can, and I can assure the member that is what we are committed to doing as a government; and that is precisely what we are committed to doing, not to saying yes to any established interest that is out there. The people who come first, the people whose interests come first, are the residents, the people who are themselves disabled and vulnerable. Those are the people whose interests we must advance as a Legislature. That is what we are committed to doing and that is exactly what we are going to do.

RENT REGULATION

Mr Tilson: I have a question for the Premier. Yesterday he received a letter from Fairwin Investments Ltd. Over the past eight years, foreign investors have injected \$300 million into Ontario real estate, primarily apartment buildings. They had planned to invest an additional \$500 million over the next five years but will not proceed under a system of rent controls—at least according to that letter.

Today the Minister of Housing has indicated that the government will continue with a system of strict rent controls during this moratorium period, and, as a result, almost \$1 billion in capital will most likely be moved out of this province.

I would like to ask the Premier if his government has done an economic impact analysis of his decision to proceed with rent controls.

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, I would say to the member that I am not aware of such a letter, although no doubt it has arrived. I have not seen it, but I would like to refer the question to the Minister of Housing, if I can.

Hon Mr Cooke: I guess how I would like to respond to that is that we did. When we were looking at the policy options that were open to this government to provide real protection for tenants, we did look at the impact on the economy.

We also looked at the impact that the current rent review system has on tenants across this province, and the fact of the matter is that we have had no protection or not adequate protection for tenants in this province. As a result, 33% of the tenants of this province pay over 30% of their monthly income on rent. As a result, people have been economically evicted from their apartments in this province and, because this party believes that housing is a basic and fundamental right for the people of this province, it is our obligation as a government to properly protect the tenants of this province so that this right can be achieved.

1430

Mr Tilson: I hope the minister will make this analysis available to this House, because I think the policy he announced today is certainly going to have a grave impact. Today the minister announced that there would be a moratorium for the next two years. Landlords across this province have borrowed money in the past number of years to undertake renovation and repair work. Considering his statement today and given the number of outstand-

ing loans, has his government assessed the number of bankruptcies that will result from his decision? Will he announce that today?

Hon Mr Cooke: I am certainly prepared—and we will as we go through this process—to share every bit of information we have that helped us make this decision. But I want to reiterate to the member that on the government side we have to look at the balance between what is necessary to protect the affordable housing that currently exists in this province and, on the other hand, what is rightful and appropriate for landlords in this province.

I have looked at that and I think on balance we have to come down with proper and complete rent control in order to protect tenants, along with the escape clauses, which we have outlined to members, with energy costs and municipal taxes.

I would simply like to ask the member: The alternative he has suggested, the alternative his party suggested, is what they have in British Columbia. In British Columbia they have no rent control, and as a result Vancouver's average rents now are the highest in the entire country. We in Ontario do not want to see that happen. We want to protect tenants in this province.

Mr Tilson: I honestly believe the minister forgets where he is. We ask the questions over here and he gives the policy.

I will say that the Ministry of Housing has reported that \$10 billion in renovation and repair work is needed to maintain Ontario's existing rental stock. If his government proceeds with this system of rent controls, as he has indicated today, with no provision for capital costs, landlords have indicated that they will not proceed with \$533 million worth of renovation and repair work this year alone. By 1992, \$1.68 billion of planned work will be in jeopardy. Unemployment rates in the low-rise construction trades have already reached 60%.

I would like to ask the minister if he has done an analysis of how many construction and related jobs will be lost as a result of his decision to proceed with strict rent controls during this moratorium period.

Hon Mr Cooke: I would like to point out to the member that I am not sure what analysis he has done or any other organization has done to come up with the \$500 million figure. With the figures we have looked at in our ministry, the largest amount of capital spent in one year, passed through the system, under the current rent review system—that is certainly the comparable figure—has been \$122 million. Now, during a recession and during the Mulroney high interest rate time, is he going to tell me that the landlords of this province are planning on spending \$500 million through the rent review system?

I would suggest to the member that what will have the most significant impact on whether landlords will be spending money on renovations and capital in this province will not be anything that we do in this government, but it will be the high interest rate policies of his federal government.

Ms Poole: My question is for the Minister of Housing. It is estimated that some \$10 billion in capital repair work

needs to be done on our aging housing stock. The rental freeze he has announced today is effectively going to ensure that none of that capital work will be done over the next two years.

I would like to paint a scenario for the minister, and I would assure him that this is a very real one, particularly with high-rise buildings.

An underground parking garage needs to be retrofitted because of salt corrosion. It will cost \$500,000 to do this work. The landlord goes to the bank to secure the financing. The bank says: "I'm sorry. You're already leveraged to the maximum, and because you have no revenues coming in to compensate, we cannot do this. You have no collateral." The landlord cannot borrow the money. The landlord does not have the money. The garage will collapse and so will the building from the salt corrosion. What is the minister going to do about this?

Hon Mr Cooke: I guess what I would like to say to the member is that over the next period of time we certainly intend to put out a consultation paper and discuss with her and with other people in this province how we should proceed in the long term. But in the meantime we have to take a look at some of the very high rent increases that have occurred in this province. I would suggest to the member she take a look at, for example, 44 Walmer Road where there was a 21% increase, or in her area, the Balliol Street area, a 29% increase, or if she wants to look at Main Street, a 192% increase.

The member, as an advocate for tenants in this province, must understand as well that our government is preoccupied and concerned with protecting the tenants and the affordable housing stock of this province. That is our primary concern and we are willing to work with her and with the landlords and tenants of this province in devising a long-term system that will also protect tenants and provide for the capital needs of the system as well.

Ms Poole: This minister is not concerned with protecting the tenants. He is concerned with protecting his own government's skin. He says the tenants need protection. I agree with him, but this is not the way, to say that for the next two years, while he consults, nothing will be done on capital.

I am going to ask the minister for an answer to the question I posed to him in my statement today when I responded to his announcement. What is he going to do about the situation where the work is halfway done and where the landlord knows there is no compensation for him for completing the work? I have a landlord right now who is saying that he is going to walk away from it. What is he going to do about the buildings where that capital work is half done?

Hon Mr Cooke: The very nature of the moratorium means that there are going to be some difficulties with it. I am not here to tell the member that anybody can bring in a moratorium and simply say that there are not going to be any difficulties, but I am prepared to tell her that under the current legislation 330,000 tenants experienced rent increases that were incredibly difficult to deal with. We have to provide proper protection for tenants. I am prepared,

and it will be seen as we work through the system of consultation—we said in the statement that it is a maximum of two years—to go through that process and come up with the long-term proposals as quickly as possible. We will not deviate from the principle that the current rent review system is inadequate and does not provide protection for tenants. The proposal we have before members and the long-term proposal will provide that kind of protection as long as we are here.

PROTECTION OF IN-CARE RESIDENTS

Mrs Marland: My question is for the minister responsible for disabled persons. Yesterday we heard the horrific stories—pardon me, not stories—the horrific facts that are contained in this report dealing with people in residential care who have both physical and mental disabilities. I am personally familiar with these families in my riding, and in fact among my own personal friends. I know on a firsthand basis the agony these families go through when they first have to make the decision that they themselves can no longer care for these people in their own homes. So then they make the decision that they will entrust that care to people in outside facilities. Now they learn that people in those same facilities are choking to death because they have been fed too quickly, are starving to death because of inadequate nutrition, and in some cases are seriously injured.

1440

Based on what the minister must have read, along with the rest of us—I give her one example from the *Globe and Mail* today where a report by two paediatricians states, "Severe malnutrition, dehydration and the failure of staff to recognize symptoms of serious illness contributed to the deaths" of those 15 residents at Brantford—I ask her on behalf of these families who have their loved ones in these facilities because they cannot even feed themselves and need total human care to survive, which is their own basic right, what can we tell these families who have heard these horrid, chilling facts? What is going to happen to their loved ones?

Hon Ms Ziemba: I am going to excuse myself. I do have a bad cold so my voice might sound a bit garbled.

I want to thank the honourable member for bringing this to our attention because I share those concerns as well. It is one of the reasons why I entered politics and why I wanted to be elected. For far too long there has not been anything done to make sure that people who live in institutions and who need and require that care have advocacy and guardianship.

We mentioned in our throne speech that for the last 15 years there have been reports gathering dust on the shelves which have not been answered and have not been actually addressed. We are going to address that quickly and expediently. I promise the member we will bring that to this House at the very quickest possible moment we can.

Mrs Marland: We pay people in this province to take care of our loved ones in these facilities. That is their job. It is our responsibility that these people are well cared for. I do not think that on top of that we need to start looking for advocates. The people who work there should be advo-

cates for the rights of those people, and the government, no matter who it is, has to start today to make sure that their rights for health protection and safety in those institutions are protected.

These are government-funded facilities. We are not talking about intruding into private homes. We are talking about government-funded facilities where staff are paid to give that kind of care. I ask the minister again, what can I tell the parents, the relatives and the loved ones of these residents today that she is going to do to make a difference?

I am not interested in an advocacy commission that will issue yet another report 12 months from now which, as the minister has just identified, will gather dust. I am asking her what has happened today that is different from what happened yesterday as a result of this report, and what assurances can these families have who have heard this horror story, these chilling facts? I beg of the minister to tell us what the difference is going to be tomorrow, not 12 months from now.

Hon Ms Ziemba: I do want to reassure the families, and I want to reassure the member and all the other members in this House. We all share the same common concerns and I think all of us have constituents who have people in institutions who are not being adequately cared for.

Obviously, we have just got the report. We will be communicating with the Ministry of Community and Social Services and also the Ministry of Health to make sure that this does not happen again. We will be doing that immediately and we will be doing all the various things that have to be done to make sure that people are adequately cared for in institutions and in private homes as well. So we will be bringing forth all those various aspects.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr Huget: My question is for the Minister of Labour. The minister is no doubt aware of the hardships being experienced by injured workers in this province because of excessive delays by the Workers' Compensation Board in processing claims. Many claims go for months before decisions are made and workers who once earned a good income are being forced to turn to welfare to feed their families while they wait on the system.

What steps is the minister taking to speed up the adjudication of workers' compensation claims so that injured workers do not have to suffer further injury or face poverty along with the pain and suffering caused by their workplace injuries?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I want to thank the member for his question because it is one that I think concerns every member on all sides of this House. All our constituency offices are filled with frustrated WCB claimants who feel real and legitimate complaints about the length of time taken to process their claims.

The excessive delays being experienced now are not the fault of the adjudicators of the board. I want to make that clear, and it is not just my opinion. I have talked to the office of the worker adviser and the office of the employer

adviser. The employees of the WCB are doing the best they can under a very high stress situation.

We are telling the WCB that we are not satisfied with the service levels to claimants. In fact, I will be having a meeting with the chairman of the board on this tomorrow morning and I will be asking him to come up with ideas on how service can be improved quickly. There is now a vacancy in the office of the president of the Workers' Compensation Board and we are conducting a public search for a new president. One of the most important criteria we will have in selecting the new top management of the board will be the individual's demonstrated commitment towards better customer service. I agree with my colleague that injured workers need speedier adjustment of their claims in Ontario.

Mr Huget: I thank the minister for his commitment and I hope we will soon start to see some real progress in this area.

May I ask if the minister is aware of the many specific complaints about the difficulty of reaching adjudicators by telephone? Many of my constituents come to me in my offices in frustration after trying to call the board for hours, sometimes days, with no success. When they do get through, they often encounter an answering machine on which they leave a message, and I am told that many of these calls are never returned. Is there something that can be done quickly to relieve this situation so that injured workers and their representatives will be able to at least talk with their adjudicator?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I think all of us have heard of the delays and of the phone calls and the promises by an answering machine to call back that just do not come about. This is one of the issues that is on the table for our discussions tomorrow morning with the chairman of the board. This is one of the issues that the new management of the board, the new president when we bring one in for the board, will be asked to look at specifically, and that is the level of customer service at the board. We have had a long period of time when they have been going through policy changes. That will now change. We are now looking at the adjudication and that will be the emphasis of the management team at the board.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr Offer: My question is to the Minister of Labour. The minister continues to be unclear on his government's proposal to increase the minimum wage. An Agenda for People and the throne speech stated that the minimum wage would be 60% of the average industrial wage. In opposition the member was very clear. He introduced three bills into this House which called for immediate implementation of 65% of the average industrial wage at that time.

The minister is playing with the workers of this province who are expecting this increase and with employers who are facing tough economic times, and as well with potential investors in this province. They deserve answers. Will the minimum wage in 1994 be 60% of the average industrial wage in 1994?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I thought I had answered that twice for the member yesterday. I have said very clearly that the minimum wage will be 60% of the average wage in the province of Ontario, and that is what it will be when we finish with our new plan.

Mr Offer: My question was very specific: Would the minimum wage in this province be 60% of the average industrial wage in 1994? Very clearly, the minister in response omitted the words "average industrial wage in 1994." Now I want to know: Will the minimum wage in this province in 1994 be 60% of the average industrial wage in 1994?

There are people who have to plan. There are workers who are expecting this particular response. There are employers who are facing tough economic times. There are potential investors who are looking to this province who want to know very clearly what the position of this government is and what the minimum wage in this province will be in 1994. A response that just refers to 60% of the average industrial wage is not clear enough. We want to know, will it be the average industrial wage in 1994? The question is posed to the minister specifically; I expect a very specific response.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I do not know how I could get any more specific. It will be 60% of the average wage in the province of Ontario, and obviously it will be 60% of the average wage in Ontario in 1994.

1450

MARKET VALUE REASSESSMENT

Mr Turnbull: My question is to the Minister of Revenue. Could the minister confirm that her government will not authorize the reassessment of over one million residential and business properties in Metropolitan Toronto as planned by the previous Liberal government and will thereby save the taxpayers of this province up to \$20 million?

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: At this time I cannot make that commitment. I have presently made arrangements to speak with Mayor Eggleton of Toronto and Chairman Tonks and I have also made arrangements to talk with some other members in my own caucus.

Mr Stockwell: How about the Metro chairman?

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: There are some Metro people coming to meet with me. I am not able to make that commitment at this time.

Mr Turnbull: In light of the stated policy position of the NDP at the 1984 biannual convention, which states very clearly, "The NDP opposes any further introduction of market value reassessment," and based upon the responses during the recent election from the NDP member for High Park-Swansea, the NDP member for Dovercourt, the NDP member for Riverdale and the NDP member for Don Mills on a questionnaire prepared by the Citizens for Property Tax Reform during the last election, will the minister please confirm her government's position regarding the imposition of market value reassessment in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: At this time I am not prepared to make my government's decision on market value assessment in Toronto. As I have said previously, I am meeting with various people to find out about market value assessment in Toronto, how it is going to affect Toronto and what our position is.

Mr Owens: First, I would like to thank the opposition for being concerned about the warm weather outside and turning the heat up a little bit in here today. My question is for the Minister of Transportation—

Interjections.

The Speaker: The enthusiasm displayed by the members is certainly appreciated. What would be even more appreciated is if the enthusiasm could be tempered with listening.

Mr Scott: Are you kidding? Our model is Peter Kormos. I didn't know anything about opposition until I met Peter Kormos.

The Speaker: And I am sure the member for St George-St David would like to learn about opposition from inside the chamber. Now, if we are all nice and calm and quiet—

Mr Mahoney: Impeach, impeach.

The Speaker: I knew that was coming. I just wondered how long. Since we have now captured everyone's attention, perhaps the member for Scarborough Centre could place his question.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

Mr Owens: Mr Speaker, as you are so fond of saying, before I was so rudely interrupted, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation.

In light of the fact that we have just come out of the Year of the Disabled, myself and my constituents in Scarborough Centre are quite concerned that this group was not mentioned in the minister's statement on transportation policies for the future. I am wondering if the minister can explain to myself and my constituents how this policy will impact on the disabled.

Hon Mr Philip: As members of the Toronto Transit Commission are well aware, it was contained in the proposals that were going towards them regarding the improvements in the GO system.

I am committed to the TTC's Choices for the Future report and I have been working with the TTC to make all new stations accessible and to have the retrofitting of selected other stations. We are committed to the easier access program and, as members have seen in the news, I have launched with various transit authorities new initiatives in that field. This year my ministry is spending some \$32 million on providing door-to-door access for disabled persons and elderly people.

Mr Owens: I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation again to be more specific about the plans his ministry has to encourage the use of public transportation by the elderly and persons with disabilities.

Hon Mr Philip: We have a five-year plan that deals with a number of specific areas: First, increased

availability of special transit services—I have just told the member how much money we are spending on it this year; expanded eligibility for the use of special transit services; improved accessibility to conventional transit services; a program for the disabled in small and rural communities; an accessible taxi cab program; senior citizens' fare reciprocity; and a long-term commitment to improving the GO system so that GO stations and the GO service will be accessible to disabled and elderly people.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr Mahoney: My question is to the Premier. The Minister of the Environment, after little more than a week in this Legislature, has certainly left her mark. However, in the minds of many citizens and political leaders, at least in Mississauga and I am sure in the rest of Ontario, the mark is indeed a black one.

This four-page fax that I have received from Mayor Hazel McCallion is a resolution passed unanimously by Mississauga council last Monday night. It is only one single indicator of the concern raised by the minister's derailing the processing of site 6B in Brampton.

The mayor and council will be looking for a meeting with the minister within one week from today and, with the Premier's desire to consult, I am sure that meeting will take place.

My question is: Does the Premier accept the minister's dismissal of efforts to find an interim site such as 6B, thereby allowing expansion of the Britannia sanitary landfill site by way of her emergency powers, a situation that means no public consultation and little, if any, accountability?

Hon Mr Rae: Let me say first of all that I am sure the Minister of the Environment looks forward to a meeting with Mayor McCallion—

Mr Mahoney: I doubt that.

Hon Mr Rae: No, I am sure she does. Certainly, I have enjoyed all my encounters with the mayor and I am sure the minister will as well, in terms of a good session, a good discussion. It will be a good, frank exchange.

The member said something about no accountability. I cannot imagine a more accountable process than the one we are undergoing now, that we will be undergoing as a government over the next few years and in which the issue of waste reduction and getting at the garbage problem is going to be a priority for all of us. When the member says that this somehow is an unaccountable process, I can only say to him that I am accountable to him and to all the members of the House every day in question period. I am accountable to the people of the province, as he is, at election time. We are going to be as accountable as anything over the next while.

1500

The member asked me if I agree with the announcement that was made by the Minister of the Environment. Obviously I agree with the announcement of the Minister of the Environment, because it focuses attention in a way that I think needed to be done on the urgency of the situation and of the need for us, after such a long time,

to get on with the business of reducing the amount of garbage that goes into the waste stream. That is the objective and purpose of the minister's announcement, and that is the reason it has been done.

Mr Mahoney: I guess I got the answer that he agrees, but I also am interested in the fact that it is becoming very clear to the mayor and council in my city, Mississauga, and to myself and other concerned citizens that the minister's conservator action plan is at best in the conceptual stages. The minister was asked yesterday and was not forthcoming with an answer, but perhaps the Premier can tell this House: What are the time lines, what are the costs, what are the targets for waste reduction, what percentage of waste will be diverted in the first year of the program and when will the first year of the program start?

The people want answers about this announcement, and they are not getting any from the minister. Will the Premier give them?

Hon Mr Rae: To the member, in as non-partisan a way as I can, when we took office on 1 October we found that the Liberal government had made an announcement with respect to a 25% objective on the reduction of waste by 1992. The statement was made by the previous Minister of the Environment and by the Premier at that time that any municipality that did not reach the 25% level would not be able to join in on the Solid Waste Interim Steering Committee program and take advantage of the other "plans" he said quote plans of the Liberal government at that time. What we found was that, generally speaking, most municipalities were nowhere near the 25% mark. Some were closer than others, but there was no sense of direction, of central leadership, coming from the Minister of the Environment to reach that target. That is why we have said we have to not only reach but exceed that target. That is the objective of our government. I can only say to the member that those announcements will be made shortly and soon. They will be decisive and clear and they will, we hope, lead the province and lead the way in terms of reducing the amount of garbage that goes into the stream. That is the objective; that is what we are trying to do.

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL POLICE

Mr Carr: My question is for the Solicitor General. As the minister is well aware, yesterday the Provincial Auditor delivered his final accounting of the activities of the previous government. In his report I was very disturbed to notice that there is a severe inadequacy in the Ontario Provincial Police staffing levels. This is having a direct effect on the efforts to reduce crime in the province, as demonstrated by the fact that the number of crimes solved during the summer months is lower than during the rest of the year.

What plans do the Solicitor General and his government have in place to ensure that there is an adequate number of OPP officers on duty to prevent and solve crimes in our communities?

Hon Mr Farnan: The member will note that the auditor in many respects congratulated the OPP in many areas on the fine work it is doing, as are police personnel across this province. The member is drawing his question

from the document that was produced yesterday. If the member had gone two pages farther he would have found the answer on page 178. Basically, it is a problem, but a problem, I might add, that has been addressed and is being addressed.

We have a memorandum of understanding and there is a collective bargaining process. Police officers, like other persons in society, are entitled to vacations. It is not an unreasonable expectation for police personnel to have some of that vacation time during the summer when their families are at home. There is a policy in place where only one member in six will take leave at that particular time. We are trying to encourage that, where possible, there will be policing at all times to the greatest effect, whether it is on the weekend or during the summer period. The OPP officers and the police across this province provide effective services throughout the year, 12 months of the year, winter and summer.

The Speaker: Although time has expired for question period, due to the lengthy response by the Solicitor General, if the member for Oakville South has a supplementary, I will allow him to place it.

Mr Carr: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

The Provincial Auditor gave the government the solution to the problem in his report. Mr Archer determined that 33% of the officers' available hours were spent on administration. This is not acceptable. Mr Archer also determined that on average only 15% of the officers' time was actually spent on patrol; this is not acceptable. The auditor pointed out that each 1% reduction in the administration work rate would save 75,000 hours a year that the OPP could use in other areas. Yet the OPP pointed out that funds required for one method of reducing administration hours are "currently not available."

Over the past five years, the number of violent crimes in this province has increased by 37%, yet police are spending more and more of their time filling out paper. What is the Solicitor General going to do to ensure that the fine police officers in this province do not have to waste their time on paperwork when they should be out on the streets? I say to the Solicitor General, let's get the police back on the streets where they are needed.

Hon Mr Farnan: I point out to the member that in fact there is something of a contradiction in the auditor's report. On the one hand, the auditor is saying, for example, that there must be more enforcement in terms of speeding. Of course, the members will realize that this causes more paperwork, more court time, etc. On the other hand, they are saying we should reduce this amount of time for administration, and I am sure the OPP is taking every effort to reduce paper time. In fact, I would suggest to the House that the initiative taken in terms of Ontario municipal and provincial police automation co-operative, the computer system we are putting in, is a direct effort to reduce administration time and to increase the enforcement component.

Let me also say that in an ideal world our police services could provide all the services, but in reality, our police services at all times must make choices between

different areas in which they must work. I believe they do this extremely well, sensitive to the needs of the community, in touch with the community and implementing and enforcing the law as the community requires.

PETITIONS

CAPITAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS

Mrs Sullivan: I have three petitions from 135 people, residents of Halton Centre, relating to a request for capital funding for the construction of an elementary school in the Iroquois Ridge in Oakville. I concur with the view of these people that a school is needed in that area and I am pleased to affix my signature to the petition.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr Wood: I have two petitions on gas pricing in northern Ontario. One of them is concerned with the prices since the Gulf crisis; the other one is concerned with the price of gas over the last 15 to 20 years being different in northern Ontario from southern Ontario. I affixed my name to the petitions. There are some 650 names on the petitions.

1510

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

RESIDENTIAL RENT REGULATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Hon Mr Cooke moved first reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986.

Motion agreed to.

INTERLOCK PEOPLE LTD ACT, 1990

Mrs Cunningham, on behalf of Mr Cousens, moved first reading of Bill Pr17, An Act to revive The Interlock People Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE SIZE

Miss Martel moved resolution 2:

That, notwithstanding standing order 108(a) and for the duration of the 35th Parliament, no standing or select committee shall consist of more than 12 members.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Miss Martel moved resolution 3:

That the membership of the standing committees for this session be as follows:

Standing committee on administration of justice: Messrs Carr, Chiarelli, Fletcher, Harnick, Mrs Mathysen, Messrs Mills, Morrow, Poirier, Sorbara, White, F. Wilson and Winninger.

Standing committee on estimates: Messrs Carr, Daigeler, Hansen, Mrs Haslam, Messrs Jackson, Lessard, Mrs Marland, Mr McGuinty, Mrs McLeod, Mr Perruzza, Ms Ward and Mr G. Wilson.

Standing committee on finance and economic affairs: Messrs Christopherson, Hansen, Jamison, Kwinter, G. Phillips, Sterling, Stockwell, Mrs Sullivan, Messrs Sutherland, B. Ward, Ms M. Ward and Mr Wiseman.

Standing committee on general government: Messrs Abel, Bisson, Brown, Drainville, Duignan, Ms Harrington, Messrs Mammoliti, Mancini, B. Murdoch, Mrs Y. O'Neill, Messrs Scott and Turnbull.

Standing committee on government agencies: Messrs Bradley, Frankford, Grandmaître, Mrs Haslam, Messrs Hayes, McGuinty, McLean, Runciman, Silipo, Stockwell, Waters and Wiseman.

Standing committee on the Legislative Assembly: Messrs Cooper, Duignan, Frankford, Mrs MacKinnon, Mrs Marland, Mrs Mathysen, Messrs McClelland, Morin, Ms S. Murdock, Messrs H. O'Neil, Owens and Villeneuve.

Standing committee on the Ombudsman: Messrs Curling, Duignan, Mrs Fawcett, Messrs Henderson, Huget, Mrs Mathysen, Messrs Mammoliti, Morrow, B. Murdoch, Wes-senger, White and Mrs Witmer.

Standing committee on public accounts: Messrs Bradley, Callahan, Charlton, Conway, Cooper, Cousens, Hayes, Johnson, Mrs MacKinnon, Messrs O'Connor, Ms Poole and Mr Tilson.

Standing committee on regulations and private bills: Messrs Abel, Ferguson, Fletcher, Johnson, Jordan, Mrs MacKinnon, Messrs Miclash, O'Connor, Ruprecht, Sola, Sutherland and J. Wilson.

Standing committee on resources development: Messrs Arnott, Charlton, Ms Churley, Messrs Cleary, Dadamo, Huget, Jordan, Klopp, Offer, Ramsay, Waters and Wood.

Standing committee on social development: Mr Beer, Mrs Caplan, Mr Cordiano, Ms Haeck, Messrs Hope, Malkowski, Martin, Mrs McLeod, Messrs Owens, Silipo, J. Wilson and Mrs Witmer.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

Miss Martel moved resolution 4:

That the following schedule for committee meetings be established for this session:

The standing committee on administration of justice may meet on Monday and Tuesday afternoons following routine proceedings; the standing committee on estimates may meet on Tuesday afternoons and Wednesday afternoons following routine proceedings; the standing committee on finance and economic affairs may meet on Thursday mornings and Thursday afternoons following routine proceedings; the standing committee on general government may meet on Thursday mornings and Thursday afternoons following routine proceedings; the standing committee on government agencies may meet on Wednesday mornings; the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly may meet on Wednesday afternoons following routine proceedings; the standing committee on the Ombudsman may meet on Wednesday mornings; the standing committee on public accounts may meet on Thursday mornings; the standing committee on regulations and private bills may meet on Wednesday morn-

ings; the standing committee on resources development may meet on Monday and Wednesday afternoons following routine proceedings, and the standing committee on social development may meet on Monday and Tuesday afternoons following routine proceedings; and that no standing or select committee may meet except in accordance with this schedule or as ordered by the House.

Motion agreed to.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

DÉBATS SUR LE DISCOURS DU TRÔNE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mrs Marland: The throne speech of the New Democratic government has great significance to the people of Ontario since it sets out the first believable agenda of Ontario's first socialist government. I say the first believable agenda because the government is already breaking promises contained in *An Agenda for People*, which the NDP developed for the election campaign.

However, if we think of the throne speech as being our map to NDP policy, this map would certainly cause us to lose our way. I assume that the vague philosophies and objectives set out in the speech will be translated into concrete action in the near future. In the meantime, though, there are many parts of the throne speech which worry me.

First, as the Progressive Conservative spokesperson for the greater Toronto area and the MPP for a riding in the GTA, I am worried that the GTA now means "geographic territory absent" from the throne speech. The four million people who live in the GTA had hoped that the appointment of a minister responsible for the greater Toronto area signalled an understanding by the NDP government that a new approach was needed to managing the growth of the greater Toronto area. Yet the words "greater Toronto area" never appear in this throne speech.

In fact, a backgrounder provided by the GTA minister estimates that the greater Toronto area's population will increase by approximately 50% over the next 35 years. Yet even today the GTA is splitting at the seams. Our highways and public transit systems are clogged beyond capacity. We have an affordable housing crisis of epidemic proportions. New development is consuming prime agricultural land while older, more central areas decay. There is no co-ordinated plan for waterfront development and our growth is not environmentally sustainable. Surely the special and serious problems facing the GTA deserve more than a no-mention.

So far, the post-throne-speech announcements regarding the GTA have been no more reassuring than the speech itself. Consider waste management. The Minister of the Environment, who has responsibility for the GTA, has proposed a cure that may be worse than the ailment. Granted, the minister's objectives of greater reduction, reuse and recycling in order to divert materials from landfill sites, combined with a more appropriate environmental assessment process, are shared by us all, but I

would like to tell her that some of those things are already being done in the landfill site that serves my riding—namely, Britannia—where they have not accepted cardboard and wood for some time.

The minister is not being realistic. She has not released any details regarding a 3Rs program and she has decided to continue the previous government's policy of more discussion on how to change the environmental assessment process, despite recommendations received four years ago from the Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy.

Without action on the 3Rs and the EA process, we will not have a new landfill site ready in 1993 when all the current GTA sites will be full. Three GTA sites—Keele Valley in Vaughan, Brock West in Pickering and Britannia in Mississauga—will be asked to take more garbage than they were designed to hold. That is an environmental risk as well as being grossly unfair to those communities. In the event of an emergency, two proposed sites in Brampton and Pickering may even be opened to take garbage without an environmental assessment whatsoever.

This is not waste management for the GTA; it is waste mismanagement. Frankly, we expected far more from this new minister.

Another concern about the new GTA waste management plan is who will pay for the bill for hauling garbage from the five regional municipalities to one long-term site. Frank Bean, chairman of the region of Peel, estimates that the current annual bill of \$30 million to dump garbage at Peel's Britannia site in Mississauga could escalate to \$130 million per year to haul garbage outside of Peel.

The previous Liberal government financed many of its new programs by offloading the costs on to the municipalities and their property taxpayers. I certainly hope the GTA's waste management announcement does not signal that the NDP government will continue the Liberal tradition.

This year, taxpayers in my riding of Mississauga South faced increases of 9.4% for the regional portion of their tax bill, 7.7% for the municipal portion and staggering increases of 17.2% for the Peel Board of Education taxes and 16.5% for the separate board taxes. The property taxpayers cannot afford to pay such increases year after year. They cannot afford to pay the extra costs of hauling garbage outside the region of Peel.

During the election campaign, the NDP promised a new provincial-municipal partnership. But how can we believe this promise when there is no mention of it in the throne speech and one of the government's first major announcements leaves us wondering whether another expensive provincial initiative will be financed on the backs of the property taxpayers?

1520

Another crucial greater Toronto area issue is the need to repair and replace aging infrastructure. The throne speech promises that \$700 million will be spent on repairing and maintaining public sector facilities, yet according to the figures released by the minister responsible for the greater Toronto area, over the next 35 years the GTA infrastructure will require spending of from \$74 billion to

\$79 billion in 1990 dollars. That amounts to more than \$2 billion per year for just the GTA infrastructure, so how is only \$700 million going to do the job? And is that \$700 million going to be spent in the GTA? As I said before, the words "greater Toronto area" are never mentioned in this throne speech.

The GTA is not my only worry. As the Progressive Conservative spokesperson for disabled persons, I am concerned about two issues of concern to disabled persons: employment equity and advocacy. These were not addressed in the throne speech. I trust that the government will also give its immediate attention to issues beyond advocacy and employment equity. Certainly we had some very horrific examples in the last two days of why there is such an urgent need to those issues pertaining to people with disabilities.

I am pleased that the government has promised action on the advocacy report that has "been gathering dust for far too long." However, on behalf of disabled persons across this province, I hope the action comes sooner rather than later.

May I take this opportunity to remind the new government that last November the minister responsible for disabled persons tabled the annual report of the Ontario Advisory Council for Disabled Persons. In that annual report, the phrases "waiting," "under review" and "currently reviewing" describe the status of reports such as Independent Living: The Time is Now, about attendant care, and The Freedom to Move is Life Itself, about transportation. More than a year later, we still have made little progress on the recommendations of these very valuable, very comprehensive reports.

In addition, we discovered last spring that the previous Liberal government actually cancelled—and I emphasize this because we could not believe it—its supportive community living program and the Ontario home renewal program for disabled persons. It is pretty hard to believe, but it is not hard to understand why that government is no longer in office.

I have received calls both from constituents and from residents of Metropolitan Toronto concerning problems with booking rides on the Transhelp and the Wheel-Trans services for persons with disabilities. These services are unable to meet the demand for transportation, to the point where some clients have missed important doctors' appointments when their rides have fallen through at the last minute. As these services rely upon subsidies from the provincial government, this is a matter the new government must address. Of course, we are not only talking about appointments with physicians, hospitals and physiotherapy; we are talking about the basic need for people with disabilities to commute to their places of employment.

Having covered some of the key issues regarding disabled persons, I will turn to my concerns as the Progressive Conservative spokesperson for Culture and Communications. The throne speech says: "We recognize the importance of the arts to the economy and to the quality of our lives. We will augment our support of artists and arts organizations through the Ontario Arts Council."

Again, the NDP government is short on details. Again, we must wait and see.

The new government knows that, given its recent decision to reverse the previous Liberal government's funding commitment to the ballet opera house, there are serious concerns in the cultural community for the future of arts funding in Ontario. We all know, however, that difficult decisions must be made in recessionary times, when it is crucial to set priorities based on human need. However, I hope the new government will not catch the Liberal government's habit of introducing legislation like Bill 114 and Bill 119, which weakened the dedication of lottery profits to the arts, culture, recreation and sports.

Returning to the concerns of my riding of Mississauga South, one of my biggest worries is the state of our education system. Earlier, I spoke of the need for more capital spending to repair and maintain infrastructure in the GTA.

In Mississauga, the capital spending needs of our schools are particularly acute. One of the worst situations in my riding is at St James elementary school. Last April I presented petitions from the students, their parents and the staff of St James school regarding the school's desperate need for capital funding. I would like to read one letter in this House from only one of these students. This letter has a little drawing on it done by that student. The letter says:

"Dear Sir or Madam:

"I am writing you this letter because we need a gym because we don't have a gym." "Don't" is spelled d-o-t. "I don't think it is not fair, because if we had a gym, then I could skip." "Could" is spelled c-o-d.

This letter is obviously written—in fact, it is—by a grade 1 student, Anna, and this grade 1 student is saying to this new government, "It isn't fair that I attend a school whose basic standards of facility are way below anything we would expect in any school in this province in 1990."

The St James students, like many students in both Peel school boards, stand a good chance of going through the elementary years with all of their classes in portables. What is different at St James is that this school does not even have a gymnasium. As we enter the winter months that make physical education next to impossible—not to mention that the school has no place to hold its public events, school concerts, Christmas celebrations—how we can anticipate what that means for yet another year to these students is very real.

As I have said, many of the letters from the children at St James that were sent to me were also sent to the former Premier and the former Minister of Education. It is hard to make these children understand why, after all their letters, they are spending yet another school year without a gymnasium or proper accommodation.

During the election campaign the New Democratic candidates promised to raise the provincial share of education costs to 60% funding for elementary and secondary schools over the next five years. Yet the throne speech, which we are responding to today—and this, I find, is the biggest irony of all—made no mention of education funding.

Again, what are we to believe? What do I tell the children at St James school or the parents of children in

other schools who are existing in substandard accommodation?

Granted, this government faces the difficult task of repairing the damage done by the previous Liberal administration. It is a considerable handicap to discover a \$2.5-billion deficit, when it was estimated by the previous government that there would be a \$30-million surplus in the provincial budget. But as the speech from the throne says, "Ontario's realities—the environment, the economy, our social services, and the challenges facing Canada itself—require leadership."

So far, I am not confident that the New Democratic Party is able to provide that leadership which this province so desperately needs.

1530

Mr Henderson: It is indeed always a pleasure to hear the erudite words of the member for Mississauga South, speaking in her eloquent way of the Tory platform, such as it may be.

I have a question, however. In her reference to the ballet opera house, the member managed to talk about that without telling us where she stands and what her view is. May I, therefore, ask the member for Mississauga South: Do she and her party, or do they not, support the building of the ballet opera house, and do they or do they not support the awarding of government funds in the order of \$55 million or so to make it possible? Do they support that or do they not?

Mrs Marland: Had the member for Etobicoke-Humber listened very carefully to my words, my words were chosen very carefully and were written very precisely because the question, the very question he is asking me today, is purely academic. What we are saying in our caucus and what I am saying in my response to the throne speech is that difficult funding decisions have to be made in recessionary times and it is crucial to set priorities based on human need.

I would respectfully suggest that the member for Etobicoke-Humber knows full well he is a member of a government that was totally incapable of setting priorities in terms of human needs. This member was a member of a government which thought it was all right to send cancer patients to Nova Scotia and Thunder Bay and elsewhere, patients who travelled outside of this province at a very traumatic time in their lives.

Also, obviously he was a member of a government that did not know what was going on or even understand what was happening with a major investment on behalf of the taxpayers of this province through the domed stadium corporation for change in design and so forth.

So I, in turn, would say to the member of Etobicoke-Humber, if he is so good at asking the questions now, where was he in giving the answers when his party was the government?

Hon Mrs Carter: I am proud to address this House as the member for Peterborough riding, and I am proud to be the minister responsible for the energy policy of Ontario's first NDP government. Before I discuss energy policy, I

want to make some personal comments and some remarks about my riding.

I was a teenager in 1945 when the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan. I was shocked that one nation could inflict such devastation on another and concerned about the long-term effects, both on the Japanese and on us all.

My children were all born in Berkshire, England, because Berkshire is the home of the atomic energy research establishment in Britain. I had encouraged my husband to work on nuclear energy research, which we thought at that time might help atone for the horror of the bomb.

Most of our neighbours and friends during those years, 1956 to 1962, were young nuclear researchers. We lived in the world of nuclear energy. I visited the reactors and met some of the leading scientists. At the same time, atomic bomb tests were proceeding and the politicians in power seemed to have no concept of what this might mean for human health.

As a mother of young children, I campaigned vigorously to end the tests. In 1963, the partial nuclear test ban removed one threat to the environment. An accident at the reactor at Sellafield in northwest England led me to realize that nuclear power was less benign than I had hoped. There was a close connection between weapons and power, and power reactors were being used to make plutonium for weapons.

This started me thinking very seriously about broader energy issues. I decided to learn more about non-nuclear methods of generating electricity. I found that the approved method of dealing with sulphur dioxide emissions from coal plants was to build taller chimney stacks to disperse them over a wider area. This is now known to be a main cause of acid rain.

I learned that large-scale electricity generation creates large-scale problems. I was gradually greened and became a proponent of energy efficiency and renewable energy. My home has had a solar water heater for years and my family has cut our personal energy use dramatically through conservation measures.

When we decided to come to Ontario, we were influenced by the fact that a large proportion of Ontario's energy was at that time generated by water power. That, of course, is why it is called hydro. We moved to Peterborough, the home of the large Canadian General Electric factory which has played such a large part in making power production equipment for Canada. In the 1950s, CGE was the magnet which drew thousands of people to Peterborough and it was long recognized as the city's main employer.

However, times have changed and Peterborough has been hit badly by the decline in industrial jobs which the federal government has accelerated with its free trade deal. Education, health and other services provide an employment base, but as in many other places, Peterborough's manufacturing base has been eroded.

My constituents are worried about jobs and taxes, about affordable housing, about health services and child care and about the environment. Last summer, beaches were closed more often than they were open. Our urban forest of maple trees is dying. The health and safety of

workers is not as well protected as it should be. Waste disposal problems are acute, particularly in the townships. Environmental problems are no abstraction to my constituents. They lower our quality of life and discourage tourists.

Farmers in my riding, as elsewhere, find it hard to make a living and are forced to raise money through lot severances, a process which threatens to undermine the integrity of farming areas and reduce our ability to produce food.

As Minister of Energy, I see energy very much as an environmental issue. The nuclear moratorium is an important part of our policy, but the key component is an unprecedented program to promote energy efficiency. We are committed to maintaining energy supplies, but we cannot do this by accepting projections of future demand as given and then scrambling to meet them. That is a road to financial and environmental disaster.

We are not asking people to suffer. We are asking them to realize that a kilowatt saved is a kilowatt earned. It costs less and it does not pollute. The technology of doing more with less energywise is moving ahead rapidly and opens up wonderful possibilities. Efficient end use of energy can reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants and save money at the same time. It is also an important economic tool, giving Ontario great competitiveness in the global market.

1540

The nuclear moratorium and the government's new energy directions are real steps towards a society based on sustainable development. The \$240 million that Ontario Hydro intended to spend for development of new nuclear plants will now be spent on conservation. The engineers and technical personnel involved will be reassigned. Ontario Hydro's agreement with AECL will be renegotiated so that there will be no specific financial support for new nuclear development.

I am asking Ontario Hydro to increase and accelerate its efforts in demand management, energy conservation and parallel generation. Ontario Hydro will also give priority to the early environmental assessment of hydroelectric projects at new and existing sites and of transmission facilities to bring electricity from Manitoba.

We will ensure that northern and native communities are consulted and that they benefit from Hydro's ongoing activities and any proposed developments which receive environmental approval. Projects with minimal impacts can be undertaken first. The Adam Beck facilities at Niagara Falls will be rebuilt. If more power is needed quickly, natural gas combustion turbine units can be brought into use.

By reducing demand for power, the recession has given us breathing space in which to make conservation work. The Environmental Assessment Board hearings on Hydro's plan will continue in order to allow public input and to assess environmental and financial costs of all major future supply and demand.

I am happy to say that Ontario Hydro's chairman, Bob Franklin, has responded very positively to our request that Ontario Hydro more actively pursue demand management,

conservation, parallel generation and the encouragement of customers to use fuels other than electricity where this is appropriate. Hydro's light replacement program has already saved 53 megawatts of electricity, enough to run a small town.

Members may be interested to hear some quotations from Mr Franklin's recent speeches. This is what he said:

"Baths and bungalows should be heated by natural gas wherever possible. Electricity is too valuable and too costly to heat dishwater. We can live just as well as we do now using less electricity if we use it more wisely. If a builder installs 15 kilowatts of electric heat in a house in Ontario, Hydro has to spend over \$50,000 to build the capacity to keep that house warm. This is not a cheap heating system."

This is Bob Franklin talking:

"Energy conservation is also a way to create jobs. Much of the effort to increase energy efficiency is labour-intensive. Conservation happens close to the point of consumption. It tends to be widely dispersed. The economic activity is not concentrated in one area."

In fact, improving energy efficiency will have widespread benefits for Ontario's economy. A Swedish study shows that a doubling of electricity end use efficiency can simultaneously displace the nuclear half of present supply, support a 54% larger gross national product, cut carbon dioxide emission by a third and reduce electricity costs by \$1 billion a year.

Compared with conventional low-energy studies, an efficiency scenario uses many times less energy, costs much less, stretches oil and gas supplies for centuries, dispenses with reliance on either the Middle East or the atom and by 2030 attains an atmospheric carbon dioxide level barely above today's. In short, it is much cheaper and cleaner today to save fuel than to burn it to get the same job done.

Because Canada has been using energy extravagantly, there are rich gains to be made through efficiency. Reduced costs will improve the export position of our industries. New manufacturers of energy-efficient appliances and equipment will provide jobs in Ontario and further help our exports to compete.

My ministry will take a leadership role in energy efficiency. Our current range of programs for business consumers and industry will be expanded. Regulations are being issued under the Energy Efficiency Act to ensure that appliances in the stores are energy-efficient. More innovative programs to replace existing appliances are being studied by my parliamentary assistant. We are working closely with other ministries, such as Housing, Transportation, Government Services, Environment and Industry, Trade and Technology, to make sure that all have energy efficiency as part of their mandate.

These new energy directions are designed to reduce the environmental impact and enhance efficiency of use of all fuels in all sectors, not just electricity. The announcement by my colleague the Minister of Transportation earlier this week serves as an example of the breadth of the government's commitment to enhance efficiency of energy use and reduction in associated environmental emissions.

The \$5-billion commitment to efficient transit systems, subways, light rail transit, busways and ride sharing will

result in enormous savings in gasoline use, much lower emissions of carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, volatile organic compounds and carbon monoxide, reductions in global warming, in ozone, in the gases that are threatening the health of our people, including our children, and the health of our planet. For example, a ministry study shows that subways consume less than 2% of the energy used by an automobile on a passenger-kilometre basis. Real savings from real commitments.

I want to emphasize that we have three major reasons for our energy policies. One is environmental: reduced fuel use is the best answer to the problems of global warming and of acid rain. One is social: not only will there be more jobs, but they will be healthy jobs, permanent jobs and jobs that will be generated evenly over the province where people live. The third is financial: we cannot afford to keep building power stations at \$25 billion each.

Hydro rates are rising faster than inflation. Ontario Hydro's massive long-term debt, now about \$26 billion, with annual interest rates exceeding \$3 billion, has been incurred mostly to pay for its current nuclear program. The increases of close to 9% for each of the next three years are directly related to the completion of the Darlington station. Future nuclear power programs are already effectively dead in Germany, the United States and other countries. Mrs Thatcher could not privatize nuclear power because the banks would not carry the risk of decommissioning or nuclear waste disposal. The British energy minister reported that nuclear cost estimates by the industry bore no relationship to actual costs.

Ontario's Candu reactors are different from those elsewhere, but their initial high performance has been falling off. In 1983, seven of the eight reactors at Pickering A and Bruce A were in the world top 10 for lifetime performance. Following pressure tube failures in 1983 and 1986, the older reactors are being retubed and their lifetime performance has dropped.

Ontario now has four of its newer reactors, at Pickering B and Bruce B, in the top 10, but currently as many as five of the older reactors are not working. That is why the government, as part of our commitment to maintaining the reliability of our electricity system, has directed Ontario Hydro to invest in measures that will improve the operating efficiency and safety of existing reactors.

In closing, I want to stress again that demand reduction through the efficient end use of energy is the main new energy direction for Ontario. The thousands of families all across Ontario who flock to buy new compact fluorescent lightbulbs are the wave of the future. The overall effect of millions of people making such changes will not only save energy and protect the environment but will help to contain energy costs.

The answer to Ontario's future energy needs is not building more nuclear plants but making a strong effort to promote efficiency, parallel generation and the development of renewable energy alternatives. Other governments have talked about changing energy directions. This government will do it.

1550

Mr Conway: I would like to make a brief comment. We have just heard a stunning speech from the Minister of Energy, one that I shall certainly review very carefully over the next 12 hours, and I am sure my colleagues and other members in the House will want to take this up at question time tomorrow.

It is, as far as I can judge, a speech at some very considerable variance with what the leader of the government has indicated. It is a stunning comment about job losses to be anticipated in my constituency. By my reckoning, the Minister of Energy has just told hundreds of people in my constituency that they will be out of work before the spring. I am sure that in Niagara Falls and in Cambridge and in Bruce and in Elliot Lake, thousands more will be very interested in reading carefully what the honourable lady from Peterborough has just announced.

I want to go on the record as expressing grave concern about her comments. As far as I can judge—believe you me, I will be reading this speech the moment the blues are available—I detect a very considerable difference between what the minister is saying this afternoon and what the Premier has said, both in the House and outside. If I were to be sitting on that Environmental Assessment Board, to which panel will be referred many of the central questions in the new government's energy policy, I cannot imagine and I do not know how I could accept the invitation in light of the minister's just completed remarks, which seem to make very clear what government policy will be.

Again, I think I heard the honourable lady say some things at fundamental variance with what the Premier has said, both in the House and outside. I repeat that as the winter of 1990-91 stares before us with rising unemployment, the honourable lady's speech is a clear signal to hundreds of people whom I represent that they will be out of work, if she has her way, within weeks, if not sooner.

Mr Elston: I likewise am quite concerned by the release of government policy today during a reply to the throne speech, which I find a very novel way to announce a whole series of layoffs for the province of Ontario. This type of speech made at this time is designed to avoid the spotlight of the press. Since the members of the press have left to fill their deadlines for the stories that must be put in the papers for tomorrow, they have missed this very important announcement.

Here, at a time when this province is suffering from layoffs and loss of jobs at a rate that we have not seen in the most recent of times, this minister chose this time to announce another series of major layoffs in this province, throwing the economies of places like Bruce county into a tailspin.

For a number of people, just prior to Christmas, at a time when things are difficult enough, this will be seen to be a very serious blemish on the economy of that great part of this province. I express very severe reservations about what she has said and, like my colleague the member for Renfrew North, I will spend a great deal of time analysing exactly what she said, because it comes just a mere two days after my friend the member for Hamilton Mountain

visited the people of Bruce county to say: "Don't worry. The NDP are a bunch of nice guys and we're saving you all from the world. We will protect you. We will build you up."

It tells me that the minister does not know what her parliamentary assistant is saying, that she does not know what the Premier is saying, that none of those people are together on this issue. She has chosen at a most inopportune time to announce a series of major layoffs in the county of Bruce and other areas around the province. I cannot believe she has done this without consulting the unions at the stations in Bruce. I cannot believe she would allow this to occur at a time when the Canadian Auto Workers are busy trying to recruit for union members at the Bruce plant.

Mr Scott: The honourable member who spoke so eloquently today will want to remember what happens to members of the NDP who speak out of line on energy matters. But leaving that aside for one moment, can I simply say that I believe her comments are sincerely held, but she has to understand that she represents the government of Ontario when she makes those statements. What she has told us today is what she would conclude if she were sitting on the Environmental Assessment Board. She has answered the questions that the government has put to the Environmental Assessment Board and told the board what the reaction of the government will be to its recommendations. In those circumstances there are, it seems to me, two practical alternatives: either the Environmental Assessment Board hearing the matter should be disbanded or the minister should resign.

Mrs Sullivan: I too am pleased to respond to the member's comments. I am also extremely concerned that in her remarks as a private member making her initial statement to the House on the throne speech, she has spoken as a minister. In fact, in her remarks she has usurped the authority of the Environmental Assessment Board, which is reviewing the demand-supply plan that Ontario Hydro has put together.

In her remarks the minister indicated that she does not believe Ontario can afford to build plants. I say we cannot afford not to have adequate electricity supplies for our businesses, for our industries, for our institutions, for our commercial operations and indeed for our residents who live in all of our communities.

The plan that has been put forward by Ontario Hydro for review at the Environmental Assessment Board is a balanced plan with various scenarios, including significant amounts of conservation. We have also seen in the past from the previous government substantial, innovative approaches in relation to energy efficiency, including a new Energy Efficiency Act for appliances and energy audits that are assisting businesses and industries and commercial operations to come to terms with reducing their dependence on energy.

Since the minister has been leaping into other areas, I wonder if she is interested in leaping into those areas further. By example, will she insist on a changed approach to buyback rates? Will she extend and insist on extending

environmental assessments to the private power projects she envisages? Will she insist that the Little Jackfish environmental assessment application, which is before the minister for review and has been there for two years, come forward?

Hon Mrs Carter: I am quite surprised by the intensity of this response to my speech, because in fact it is totally congruent with the throne speech. There is nothing whatever different there. There will be no loss of jobs. We are not phasing out the existing nuclear power stations. We are completing Darlington. Existing jobs are involved with the existing power stations, and Bob Franklin has said that the small number of people within Ontario Hydro who are working on the projected new power stations will be re-assigned. In other words, there is no job loss.

On the other hand, the policies we are pursuing will, as I stated in my speech, create jobs. They will create far more jobs per dollar of expenditure than is the case with nuclear power. They will also, as I said, be permanent jobs, and jobs that happen in places where people live.

We never said we were going to wait for the results from the Environmental Assessment Board. It is a key part of our policy that we are pursuing our policies at the same time as the board hearings are proceeding. If any members can find any point of divergence between my speech and what has previously been said, then I should be very interested to hear what it is.

1600

Mrs McLeod: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would appreciate it if there could be some clarification whether there are any rules of order that apply to a minister of the crown making a major policy statement in the House in the context of a speech from the throne response. I would appreciate that clarification, because I think it puts members of the House who have a particular long-standing interest in the major issues that were raised in the speech at a disadvantage in not being able to attend to hear that statement. I would also recognize that it puts at a disadvantage all of those people who would be affected by the indications of new policy directions that the minister has made today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): The Chair will take the request under consideration and will be providing you with an answer in due course.

Mr McGuinty: Mr Speaker, it is an honour for me to rise in this House today to address you and my fellow members as the elected representative for Ottawa South. I am most grateful to the people of Ottawa South for placing their confidence in me and I pledge myself to do the utmost at my command to bring their concerns to bear in this House.

Over the years this chamber has witnessed the contributions made to this province by our predecessors. I am proud to follow in this tradition. There can be no doubt that politics has its problems, but these are problems inherent in the players, not in the play. Politics remains for me an honourable profession.

We would do well to keep in mind that this Parliament, like all parliaments before it, will settle nothing finally.

Our successes will only be temporary successes when examined under the light of history. Today's solutions will not solve all of tomorrow's problems. But this does not mean that we struggle here in vain to improve the lot of the people of Ontario. On the contrary, we in our turn are laying a foundation upon which our successors and their successors will build. The strength of the foundation we construct will be directly related to the breadth and depth of the vision shown by the members of this Parliament. This relationship dictates that in all of our work here we must look to the next generation, not merely the next election.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my predecessor, the former member for Ottawa South, Dalton McGuinty Sr, my father. Although he served here for only a brief period, from September 1987 until his death in March of this year, my father clearly left his mark on this House and on Ottawa South. He spared no efforts with the resources at his command, his intellect, his eloquence, his wit, his courage, to lead his constituents, his fellow Liberals and this House along a path which he felt deeply to be the right path. On behalf of the people of Ottawa South, I wish to express our heartfelt appreciation for the dedicated service rendered to us by Dalton McGuinty Sr.

On my own behalf, I pledge myself to continue in my father's tradition of dedicated and honourable service to the people of Ottawa South.

I believe there is, implicit in each member's election to this Parliament, a mandate for leadership. I believe also that if we sit in this House merely as human barometers of public opinion, that is not leadership. Leadership requires that we enlist the people of Ontario to our causes, causes espoused by us because of their unrelenting merit.

In the words of that great parliamentarian, Edmund Burke, "Your representative owes you, not his industry alone, but his judgement; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

In exercising that judgement, we must beware of influences which would divorce us from our conscience in order that we achieve a kind of schizophrenic duality. A conscience is a good thing in this House. To my mind, there is no better anchor than a conscience when we are buffeted by the winds of political expediency.

In the preamble to its speech from the throne, this new government stated that it would "open Queen's Park to those who have never before had an effective voice in the corridors of power."

Two disturbing implications arise logically from this statement. The first implication is that only this government can effectively represent some nameless group or groups. That is an unfair criticism of every past Ontario government which has made a sincere effort to represent the interests of all the people of this province.

The second implication is more ominous. It leads us to conclude that the way this government intends to represent groups, allegedly hitherto without an effective voice, is to favour the interests of such groups over the interests of the rest of the people of Ontario.

I caution this government to consider its fundamental responsibility as a government to remain responsive to all of the people of Ontario. Governments should give priority to the needs of those groups which, on the basis of objective assessment, deserve priority. A government should keep no friends. Any friends it made before it formed the government ought to be held at arm's length or they will constitute an impediment to a fair and just government.

À titre de critique pour mon parti en matière d'énergie, je constate, à ma grande déception, que le gouvernement n'a pas défini clairement ses intentions en matière d'énergie nucléaire dans son discours du trône. Les Ontariens et les Ontariennes ne savent toujours pas si le gouvernement actuel prévoit interdire la construction de nouvelles centrales nucléaires. Nous ne savons rien non plus sur ce que le gouvernement entend faire pour s'attaquer au problème du réchauffement de la planète, ce qui constitue peut-être le plus grave problème environnemental au monde à l'heure actuelle.

Nous n'avons toujours rien entendu sur la taxe sur les émissions de bioxyde de carbone, les normes sur les émissions des véhicules, les normes sur les émissions de bioxyde de carbone, la recherche sur les nouveaux types de carburants, les modifications au code du bâtiment ou la réforme des règlements portant sur le gaz naturel. Il s'agit là de dossiers chéris par le Nouveau Parti démocratique avant qu'il ne prenne le pouvoir.

I take great pride in being a Liberal member in this Parliament, for liberalism is the outlook best qualified to deal with our world. Liberalism is imbued with a spirit of progress and reform, vision and imagination. It will not shrink from the challenges of a changing world, but will welcome them. Liberalism has implicit faith in the power of men and women to do what is good and possible to meet the challenges of the future, with bigger government or bigger business or bigger unions not the answer to all our problems.

It was in the spirit of liberalism that Hubert Humphrey observed some 20 years ago, "The true moral test of government is how it treats those in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those who are in the shadow of life, the sick, the needy, the handicapped."

1610

The New Democratic Party does not have a monopoly on social consciousness. I beseech all members of this House to guard vigilantly against the loss of their idealism. If any present here have lost their idealism, then they must regain it. For what matters in every age are the ideals which inspire our efforts and the integrity of these efforts.

Our tools for use in this House in our struggle to achieve our ideals are our ideas. Ideas are powerful tools and they must be developed and used carefully. Our ideas will endure beyond the life of this Parliament and indeed beyond our own lives. They are the vehicle through which we can make a real and lasting contribution.

I would like to conclude with the words of advice written by my father, in a letter he sent while the member for Ottawa South, to all members of the last Parliament. His words are in paraphrase of St Francis of Assisi:

"Let us remember that when we leave this earth we can take with us nothing that we have received—fleeting symbols of honour, trappings of power—but only what we have given: a full heart enriched by honest service, love, sacrifice and courage."

Mr White: I want to thank the member opposite for his excellent and eloquent statements and his exhortations to us to remember our idealism. Certainly, his sincerity was clear within his comments. His ideals, I am sure, will remain intact for some time to come.

The issue he brought forth about the fact that many governments in the past have had a sincere effort to represent the peoples of Ontario is undoubtedly true. There have been occasions, however, when the sincerity of some members has waxed and waned. Some governments wax and wane.

The issues of idealism and integrity come back again and again to the fore. Certainly, the issues around integrity and honesty were very clearly brought out in the first points of the throne speech, the issues that related to conflict of interest and whistle-blowing legislation, so we have not only a commitment to our own ideals as social democrats but also a commitment that is so open that we are welcoming civil servants to speak at any point when they see any derogation of our duties.

The issue of sincerity comes time and time again to the fore. Certainly, the sincerity of the member opposite is evident. However, I have heard recently other members whose commitment to ideals seems to be limited to the colour of their ties.

Mr Beer: For many of us in the House, as we sat here listening to our friend and colleague speaking, I think there is no question but that we heard the old and familiar voice of his father, Dalton McGuinty Sr. We recall the number of times we sat in this House and listened to his father as he addressed so many issues, and always, I think, brought to those issues a certain sense of ethics, a sense of integrity, indeed a sense very much of the religion from which he came and which was so important to him.

As we sat and listened to his son today, I think we could all share in the pride that I know his father would feel. Indeed, I am sure his father is here with us in this room at this time, because it is that kind of presence that we all do feel, and we are glad to see that his son is now representing the same riding and I know will do so with the same dignity and integrity that his father served Ottawa South.

J'aimerais aussi dire que c'est pour moi un grand plaisir d'accueillir un autre anglophone — ou est-ce que je devrais dire, peut-être, un Canadien d'origine irlandaise ? — qui parle si bien le français. Je pense qu'il est très important de constater que, de plus en plus dans cette Chambre, nous pouvons en effet discuter des grandes questions de l'heure en français et en anglais. Donc, je suis très content d'accueillir notre nouveau député d'Ottawa-Sud.

Mrs Cunningham: It gives me a great deal of pleasure and some pride to rise on behalf of the members of our caucus this afternoon, many of whom knew the

father of the member for Ottawa South, and to say that in his speech this afternoon we were reminded that, on many an occasion, we shared the eloquence, the sincerity, the honesty and the great sense of humour in both this House and in the committee work his father gave on behalf of the citizens he served. If it is true that, even after many of us leave, there will be some legacy, I think he is especially privileged to know that his son was able to speak the way he did this afternoon. We share our congratulations. We are expecting much more and we think that some days the Liberals are very lucky, and this is one of them. I know you, Mr Speaker, share our congratulations.

Mr Chiarelli: I want to make a few brief comments, starting with some reference to the member's father, who was part of our caucus from Ottawa-Carleton, somebody we all respected very much. But as many members know, Dalton Sr was very tall and towered over most of us. I used to joke with him all the time that if we cut him in half we could make two good Italians out of him.

In any case, with respect to the member for Ottawa South, I do want to say that he has been an excellent addition to our Ottawa-Carleton caucus. With respect to our whole caucus, we have only the one new member because of the obvious results of the election, and I do want to say that probably if we had had a choice, we could not have picked a better member.

Mr McGuinty: I would simply like to thank my fellow members on all sides of the House for their gracious comments and wish them all the best in the days to come. I am sure that from time to time we will be caught up in the issues at hand, but I think it is crucial that we reflect upon those principles which guide us as we address the issues before us.

1620

Mr Tilson: Mr Speaker, I begin my remarks by offering my congratulations to you on your appointment to this assembly. I am sure you will serve us all with distinction in the years to come.

Mr Speaker, if you cast your mind back to your first few months in the House, you will recollect—fondly, I am sure—the excitement and invigoration of those early days as a rookie MPP. I am new to this assembly and, like so many new members from all parties, I am still immersed in those feelings. Hopefully one never loses that sense of thrill, awe and enormous responsibility which comes with this job we hold at the behest of our constituents.

None of us here would be here if it were not for our constituents. For any number of reasons, they put us here to do a job. We forget them at our peril. So as we each make our own contributions to the throne speech debate, let us do so in the context of our constituents' needs, interests and expectations.

Permit me to tell members about the constituents of Dufferin-Peel and what they might have expected to see in this throne speech. I represent the town of Caledon, the region of Peel and the county of Dufferin. There are many issues which affect my constituents, but probably none so much as transportation. To be specific, we are concerned

with the state of our roads and the absence of attractive commuter transit alternatives in our area.

A major issue for us has been the absence of GO bus service along the Highway 10 corridor to link Orangeville and Caledon with Brampton and Toronto. If you look at a GO Transit service map, you will notice a great triangular void to the northwest of Metropolitan Toronto. That is Ontario's Bermuda Triangle. It is an area to which GO does not venture. That is roughly my riding, though to be fair, there is a modest GO bus service to Bolton and Palgrave which was planned by a previous Conservative government.

We live in one of the fastest-growing areas adjacent to Toronto. My Caledon constituents pay taxes unique to the greater Toronto area and yet for the most part do not enjoy one of the fundamental services to the GTA area, namely, GO.

The former government studied the viability of extending GO bus service to Orangeville through western Caledon and found demand to be marginally sufficient. But after one excuse or another, including the rather feeble one that Orangeville lies outside GO's service area—it is in fact on the border of the GTA—we still do not have GO. I am here today in part because the former member did not convince the residents of Dufferin-Peel that she worked sufficiently hard for the realization of GO service.

Recently the chair of GO even picked up on one of the former Liberal government's many excuses, that being that private carriers already serve the area and therefore GO does not need to and should not enter our market. I find it ironic that by telling my constituents that they must make do with a bus service which is in no way comparable to GO, the chair of GO appears to be espousing a policy of privatization of commuter services. Does he, I wonder, accurately reflect government policy?

Several days ago we sat here and listened to the new Minister of Transportation sound exactly like the old Minister of Transportation as he announced his government's transportation initiatives. For the most part, these initiatives sound as if they are cribbed from the Liberals' copybook. They lack the boldness and originality that we desperately need to solve our transportation problems.

Frankly, it did not take long for the stagnant bureaucracy at MTO to hijack and hold hostage the imagination of this new minister. Simply throwing \$5 billion-plus at a problem does not necessarily guarantee its solution. Applying new thinking and deploying existing resources in effective fashion might bring about better results.

Another area where my constituents looked to the throne speech for even a glimmer of hope was health care. My community, Orangeville, has long needed a new hospital. This need was recognized locally years ago. In 1987 the former government came through with a capital commitment of \$20 million for a new hospital on a new site straddling Dufferin-Peel's border. That was at least a beginning. However, like many other health capital projects announced by the former government, the new Dufferin-area hospital became mired in procedure and squabbling.

In the week prior to my election, my Liberal opponent and the then Minister of Health staged an indoor mock sod-turning ceremony in an attempt to symbolize progress on the new hospital. I am sure that the member for Oriole, if she is listening, remembers her visit to Orangeville on the eve of the election and this event in particular with much fondness. Few in the community, however, were fooled by such theatrics, and what became known locally as "the shovel incident" came to symbolize all that was wrong and downright phony about the former Liberal government.

My constituents are looking to the new NDP government to give the green light to the next stage of the Dufferin-Caledon hospital project. Locally, we have raised money and undertaken the necessary studies to bring the health care delivery into the 1990s and beyond. The hospital is now poised to undertake a so-called functional program for the new facility. It is one more step, but a very essential step, towards the realization of everyone's dreams of better local health care.

Allow me to describe some of the concerns I have in my appointed area of responsibility within this caucus.

As critic for the Ministry of Housing, I am deeply concerned, as I expressed today, with the absence to date of any clear direction from this government in so far as housing and rent control issues are concerned. Today, of course, we simply heard of a moratorium and that was it.

I am told the minister is bright and persuasive. It is obvious, however, that he scripts his message to the particular audience he happens to be addressing. To tenants he says one thing, to landlords another—although lately he appears, certainly today at least, to be taking an increasingly hard line towards the latter group.

The apartment industry is awash in rumours of what this government intends to do. Tenant groups are clearly disappointed with the fleeting mention of housing in the throne speech. Now I know the minister will probably say that he intends to clear up the uncertainty in due course. I understand he had a press conference afterwards today, and I would be interested in hearing what that had to say, but I must digress to say that I find the coded rhetoric of this place fascinating.

I would implore the minister and his government not to lose sight of the principle of fairness that they set out to address in housing and tenant problems. It is one thing to attempt to fix a system that clearly does not work—I think we all agree on that—and it is quite another to change the rules of the game in such a fashion as to cause hardship to any one of the concerned parties. That exactly is what I fear this government has set out to do.

The retroactive application of the rules that were announced today, which themselves might be flawed, will cause great damage to the apartment industry and ultimately to the tenants themselves, and this minister and his government knew that.

Allow me to conclude my remarks by returning to my opening theme of why we are here in the first place. The proper exercise of public trust is especially challenging these days. The gap between what we as politicians promise and what we can actually deliver is sometimes

unacceptably wide for many of our constituents. No matter what we stand for, no matter what policies we put forth, our constituents expect us to at least try our best.

As we debate this particular throne speech, we should ask ourselves whether it meets the expectations of those who put us here. Does it convince Ontarians that we are heading into an area of positive change, or is it just more of the same? In that regard, I believe we have reason to be just a little bit disappointed in the content of this throne speech, or rather its lack of content and conviction. We can do better.

1630

Mr Mammoliti: Madam Speaker, I promise not to be as long-winded as the third party and the opposition today. Thanks again for giving me the opportunity to express my opinions on what I believe is a throne speech very different from those handed down by previous governments.

As a government, we have inherited a messy state of affairs, to say the least. We realized very early in our term that the next four years will be difficult ones indeed. We are in the midst of a hard-hitting recession. Couple this with a huge deficit that an insensitive Liberal government incurred because of its neglect and massive spending, and it becomes obvious that our task will not be an easy one.

As stated in the speech from the throne, my government's first challenge is to earn the trust and the respect of the people of Ontario. We make no promise, nor do we lead anyone to believe that we, as a government, are perfect or infallible. But the accent will be placed on honesty in this government, as it should be. After all, we are accountable to the people of Ontario.

Ontarians all over are well aware that the Liberal government failed miserably in implementing those policies so badly needed for the betterment of Ontario on all fronts. In areas including labour, employment equity, the environment and a fairer tax system, it is high time that legislation meets the needs of all levels of society, not that just a select few pieces be introduced.

If I may make reference to the Houdini analogy so poignantly stated by the member for Etobicoke-Humber two days ago, it perhaps appears, to me anyway, that this member is a bit unaccustomed to sitting on the other side of the House. Let me remind him and his colleagues, to recall the results of September's election. Have you ever seen so many Liberals disappear in one day? Quite the magic trick.

Our throne speech highlighted that we, as a government, plan to govern with a sense of partnership. If I could point out, this is the first government in the history of Ontario whose primary mandate is to establish a partnership in governing with those levels of society that have been neglected historically. Let me say that it is the intention of this government to extend this partnership to all those who sit on the other side of the House.

Yesterday we talked a little bit about a Tory is a Tory is a Tory.

Mr Carr: You talked about that.

Mr Mammoliti: Yes, that is right, and I still believe that, and I will believe it until all of them get up and speak

to their leader and tell him to resign. It is their responsibility, and I will not rest until they do that.

Mr Villeneuve: You sound like a Liberal.

Mr Mammoliti: In closing, we have heard the negative opinions of both the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party in response to the throne speech and this government. And yes, we have been insulted. We have been called the L-word. We have been called Liberal. That is an insult, and frankly, I am not going to put up with it. Not only did the member insult the people on this side of the House, the member insulted all the Ontarians all over who voted for us.

Hon Mr Kormos: When we turfed the Liberals out.

Mr Mammoliti: You got it. I would hope, as do the members of this government, that this is not an indication that they are unwilling to accept our invitation to govern within this partnership.

Mr Turnbull: In relation to the last speech, I would remind the member that in point of fact the last Conservative government in this House had a larger share of the popular vote than the present party in government. They had a minority, but they still had a larger share of the popular vote, and the member should consider that in relation to what he has just said.

Mrs Sullivan: I am a little disturbed by some of the comments from the member for Yorkview. They seem to be at odds with remarks that the Premier has made and I want to make it very clear to him that this was not a majority government that was formed by 100% of the population of Ontario voting for the party opposite. It was a majority that was formed by three out of eight voters who supported his party, 38% of the vote, and I hope that this member will recall that through his years in this chamber, as his Premier does and as his Premier has said.

I also want to talk about some of his remarks about things that were left undone. We saw and heard about an aggressive agenda—An Agenda for People, I think it was called—and yet what do we see being the action? Freeze, postpone, abstain, moratorium, delay—

Mr Elston: Waffle.

Mrs Sullivan: —waffle, use emergency powers to expand landfill sites when full environmental assessment processes were promised by the people opposite. I say to the member for Yorkview that they had better remember their promises and they had better be very cautious about the way they talk and think about how many people in this province really wanted them there in the first place.

M. Bisson : Je pense que le commentaire est juste, à un certain point. C'est le système parlementaire qui a mis le gouvernement en place ; c'est un système qui a très bien marché pendant 120 années. D'autres gouvernements ont été dans la même situation. Le résultat est que la plupart du monde de l'Ontario ont voté pour notre parti afin de nous mettre ici pour faire une job. La job qu'ils nous ont donnée, c'est de gouverner cette province d'une manière que je pense être un peu différente de ce qui est arrivé dans les dernières années, celles précédant 1987.

L'affaire est qu'on reconnaît qu'on a besoin de donner une atmosphère, par cette Législature-ci, un peu différente aux gens et à la population de la province. C'est important de donner de la confiance, aux gens de la province, en les politiciens qu'ils ont élus à cette Législature.

Aussi, je souhaite, pour la Législature qu'on retrouve à Ottawa, qu'on ait le même système dans lequel les gens peuvent bâtir leur confiance. L'affaire est qu'on a besoin de travailler ensemble dans cette Chambre ; ça veut dire pas seulement d'envoyer des bêtises d'un bord et de l'autre de la Chambre, mais de donner un peu de construction qui ait un peu de bon sens à la question qu'on pose en Chambre aujourd'hui. Alors, je donnerais cet avis-là aux députés ici dans la Chambre avec moi.

Mr Hope: Just a quick comment: I can understand where my colleague comes from, as the previous governments made us choose a position, and the position was to run in the last election. Now we are sitting here and we feel very confident in what we are doing. It is with great respect to the past government. That is why we are here today, but I am sure most of us feel a lot of frustration that we have been faced with over the previous years.

But I am sure that we will listen to the people of the province of Ontario, as most stated, and I think our throne speech addresses a flavour that people need to hear. They have heard promises from previous governments, and the whole issue is, where are we actually coming from? I think the people have clearly seen on this side of the table that we know where we are coming from, that one day we are not carrying our union membership cards and the next day we are capitalists, as we hear from the opposition.

With that, I think the member has clearly pointed out his views, and I really feel good about the member because I am one who was inspired to run in the last election to be here to speak on behalf of the people of my constituency in the province of Ontario.

1640

The Acting Speaker (Ms Haslam): The member for Yorkview, would you like to respond?

Mr Mammoliti: Only to respond that yesterday we also talked about the average person and how this side of the House is filled with average persons and how we feel it is important to run Ontario with the average person. I too am an average person. I am a landscaper by trade, and yes, I have shovelled the stuff that comes out of the mouths of these people every day in this House quite a bit.

In response to my colleagues opposite, I would like to just say, yes, perhaps they did have a majority at one point and they lost it, needless to say. They lost it because they got sloppy, they got lazy and they took the voter for granted. We will not take the voter for granted. We have made promises and we will stick to them. We will consult—something that has never been done in Ontario's history. We will consult. We trust. I come from the labour movement and the reason I became an MPP was because I was not consulted either. The Liberal government did not consult with us at all and neither did the Conservatives, for that matter. That is why we have a majority NDP government right now.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am pleased to rise today to participate in the debate on the throne speech. There is indeed much to debate. I will try to focus on those issues which are of the greatest concern to me, first as the representative for the people of Ottawa-Rideau and second as critic for Revenue for the official opposition.

As a representative of the people of Ottawa-Carleton in this House, I find it appalling that within this entire speech, 11 pages, there is no other mention of eastern Ontario than to recognize that its industrial and agricultural base is being battered by the recession. "Battered," a worrisome word indeed. I look for commitment to improvement. I find none. We have a problem. The members opposite recognize it, but this government continues to be silent on solutions.

How will this government stimulate the economy of this province, of eastern Ontario, develop new opportunities for the unemployed or those in need of retraining? What are this government's specific plans and priorities? Where is the cabinet committee for eastern Ontario? Has this cabinet even talked about eastern Ontario or mentioned it? The economy of eastern Ontario is more than closely tied to transportation. I must remind this government and this House that the commitment to Highway 416 must be kept, and kept on time. We have waited long enough. I hope I can trust that the Minister of Transportation will keep the promise made in this very House last week, to ensure that the timetables are adhered to. He said Highway 416 will proceed on time. I and my colleagues will be watching very closely.

I trust that a lack of specifics does not preview a disregard for the second-largest region in Ontario. Population-wise this area brings in over half a million people in its central city and many more beyond that, a region which has already had a greater-than-average unemployment rate, I remind this House. How can the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton and eastern Ontario plug in with confidence to the partnerships, to the co-operation and the creativity that are mentioned so often throughout this speech? How can the small businesses of the region I represent in eastern Ontario consider this lack of recognition to be a demonstration of fairness?

Now, may I turn to education? The throne speech speaks of "genuine access to education." This, to be sure, is a noble goal and one we would all approve of, indeed embrace. However, if we are truly going to have improved access to education, we must also ensure that we have quality education to access. This throne speech provides not one financial commitment for a new program or improvement to a program already in place, nor is there any commitment to facilities upgrading or capital expansion. Access is not enough if we have no guarantees that the education available is going to prepare our students to enter the 21st century with the knowledge and skills that they require.

I deeply regret the lack of specific educational priorities or initiatives. I am sure that, like me, many Ontarians hope that the Minister of Education will soon present her plans to this House. I trust that this minister will keep her promise that initiatives introduced will

respect all partnerships in education, those that extend to students, parents, trustees, teachers, administrators and members of the business community. Each of these groups has a key role to play at a crucial time, when so many new demands are being placed upon our educational personnel and institutions.

Genuine access to education requires a commitment to education financing. The throne speech is strangely quiet about this very crucial issue, except to say that, "Strong, publicly funded institutions are crucial to lifelong learning." A select committee of this Legislature has studied education exhaustively. The third report of this select committee, released as recently as January 1990, contains 34 recommendations respecting educational finance and was supported by all sides of this House. A 1988 NDP convention policy resolves that, "The Ontario New Democratic Party demand the immediate implementation of NDP policy to fund our education system entirely by progressive provincial income and corporate taxes."

If the proposed Fair Tax Commission, which is to study tax reform, is expected to take over a year to report its findings, how long are we going to have to wait for implementation of any recommendation from the select committee or the commission or those that have been made by individual boards throughout this province? Is that this government's idea of "immediate"?

Will the partners in education have to continue to restate again and again the needs they have so ably placed before the select committee? I suggest study is complete. Decision is the current need, indeed is long overdue.

1650

The establishment of the Fair Tax Commission is naturally of great interest to me in my role as critic for Revenue. I trust that the commission will have a very balanced membership not only in terms of interest and qualification but also truly representative of every area of this province, every region of this province, and that it will be provided with every support it needs to study an issue of such great importance.

There is mention of input from right across this province. I would suggest that it would be more than advantageous to get input from out of the province as well. We have much to gain from the experience of everyone who is knowledgeable of the many and various alternatives and options that we may consider and may take.

The use of the word "fair" in the title of this commission is fundamental. We welcome the government's commitment to fair taxation. Every taxpayer wants fair taxation, but most expect that to mean lower taxes for individuals and taxes which will continue to support economic development. If fairer taxation means higher taxation, then I am concerned about this government's intentions. If fairer taxation means our small and medium-sized businesses are less competitive, then I am very worried.

I have great trouble with the fact that this commission is expected, like many of the other consultative processes that have been introduced in this House in the last 10 days, to take up to 18 months to report, 18 months of uncertainty

in our economy where the tax burden often is a fundamental in decision-making.

A discussion of fairness of taxation policy brings me to comment briefly on this government's choice for its very first bill. Prior to the election, the oft-quoted *An Agenda for People* made some very firm promises with respect to the federal government's proposed goods and services tax. This is what they said, "Ontario should cut itself loose from the Mulroney tax program" and "Fighting the GST is a major priority of this government." Yet in its very first official legislative act this government entrenches the GST into provincial legislation. Where is the promise to fight the GST?

The speech from the throne is much more informative for what it omits than for what it says. Where is the promise to change the income tax system? Where is the promise of pay equity for women in mostly female jobs like child care? Where is the promise to create jobs for young people? Where is the promise to provide 10.5% mortgages to moderate-income families for 10-year terms? Where is the promise to build 20,000 non-profit housing units each year? Where is the promise of health care? Where is the promise to increase welfare payments and index pensions to inflation?

Instead of commitments to these promises, we get vague assertions that programs will be studied, they will go through consultation processes and will be implemented some time over the government's five-year mandate.

This is simply not good enough. The people of Ontario expect and deserve adequate answers to the questions I have just asked. The people of Ontario deserve to know the specific intentions of this government, the actual costs of their campaign promises, as well as the timetables they plan to follow.

I for one am very disappointed that this government's first speech from the throne presented so little direction or vision to Ontario at a time when, to quote the speech itself, this government must restore "confidence and enthusiasm" in this province if it is "to earn the trust and respect of the people of Ontario."

Mr Mahoney: I would like to compliment the member on that well-thought-out speech and to point out to the members for you, Mr Speaker, that we have had a couple of very eloquent speeches today given by members of our Ottawa caucus, and I believe we have another one coming up.

It shows that the people of the Ottawa-Carleton region at least retained their senses, as did the people in Mississauga and Peel, in returning the incumbents and not getting caught up in this little red blip that seemed—

Mr Villeneuve: It's orange.

Mr Mahoney: Orange or whatever colour it was. It was a funny sort of thing that happened on the 6th. I do not know what it was. Was it a burp maybe? It was a burp in the history of the province that took place.

Mr Sutherland: Tell that to the people of the province.

Mr Mahoney: Oh, Oxford, settle down. You had your chance earlier.

We are hearing from the real articulate members of our caucus today who are telling the government about their concern about things like education. The member for Ottawa-Rideau spent time along with me serving on the select committee on education, along with, as I said yesterday, the best Education minister the New Democrats never had in Richard Johnston. We came up with some really good ideas about education financing, and the throne speech, as has been pointed out by this member, totally ignored that.

It seems it might be—I do not know, my House leader could help me—another moratorium on an issue, on capital funding. Is there a freeze on capital funding? The New Democrats seem to have developed a buzzword around delay, and we used the word "waffle."

Mrs Sullivan: Waffle.

Mr Mahoney: Was it "waffle"? I think it is. Do we have a member from Waffle over there in the House? I think we have a number of them.

So we have moratoriums and freezes. What in essence our members are saying and expressing concern about is that this government has ignored education in its throne speech.

Mr Sutherland: I would like to respond to the comments that were made—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. It is his turn.

Mr Sutherland: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to respond to the comments, particularly about the goods and services tax and this government's approach. I hardly think the member and her party can speak with credibility about what our government is doing with the GST when her government and the former Treasurer, now the Leader of the Opposition, were going to charge the GST on top of the provincial sales tax. How dare they claim that our government is not doing anything when our first bill, introduced by the Minister of Revenue, is to revoke that and is to actually give the people of this—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Will you stop the clock at 52 seconds, please. Order. Make your address to the Chair. Ignore the heckling and address it to me.

Mr Sutherland: The opposition has claimed that this government is not keeping its commitment on fighting the GST. However, this government has already said what it plans to do in battling the GST. The first step was the introduction of the legislation. The other step is joining the legal battle that is now taking place over whether the federal government actually has the jurisdiction to collect the GST. These are two very strong steps which this government has taken to battle that.

I also think that if the opposition members were very concerned about issues regarding education funding and financing, they had plenty of opportunity in the last five years to deal with them and they have not.

Mr Carr: I guess I had originally thought that this House was going to have an NDP government for about four, maybe five years, but with all the criticism of the

federal government, it seems that this crew across there are all going to resign and run in the next federal election, because that is all they talk about.

I say to them, this was a provincial election. If they are concerned about what is happening at the federal level, I suggest that next time the federal election rolls around, they run again, that they put their seats here up and they run federally if they are so concerned about what is happening federally.

If not, if they are truly concerned about this province first, then I suggest they start worrying about the agenda here. If they want to run for municipal politics, they should run for municipal politics. If they want to run for provincial, they should worry about provincial. I hope the people who are so critical about the federal government are prepared to put their seats at risk and to run federally if they believe in it so much.

1700

Mr Martin: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Ottawa-Rideau on her re-election to this House and thank her for her advice and words and assure her that her concerns about education have been heard and assure her that her sense of urgency is shared by this side of the House. We will be more than happy to hear from her further and to respect the experience she has had previously in regard to these commissions that she has been on and to see that experience as valuable and as something that we can build on.

Some of the issues raised by the member around the need to fund programs and how we raise those funds were heard, and certainly for us, as for her, the operative word is "fair" and is actually the reason we choose to take some time, now that we are the government, to take a look at just exactly what that means in light of what we are discovering as we go along day to day.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I take great confidence in the remarks of the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education. I hope he will take back to his minister the opportunity that the select committee on education could be reinstated, likely should be reinstated, because we were going to begin studying technical education, indeed the funding of technical education and what I brought to the floor of the House today regarding the supply of teachers to that very important area.

I hope that he will do that and I do trust that there will be input from this side on the financing of education, and indeed members of the entire community represented on the Fair Tax Commission. The question was asked that we had lots of time to fund education. I would certainly like to remind this House that when we came on board in 1985, as has been said already in this session, \$72 million was allocated to capital. By the time we left, we were annually putting into that major facility pot \$320 million. That was to include renovations, which I also have great concern about, and new facilities.

We certainly did our part to remove the burden from the shoulders of the property tax owner in many, many communities. The 8% increase in operating should also be remembered. The moneys we gave to both the primary and

kindergarten areas of education and the primary incentive of lowering the class sizes were all initiatives that did ease the tax burden for the people in the communities in the manner in which they expected to have that fairness of educational opportunity spread right across this province.

The GST will continue to be fought by this side of the House and by the Liberal government. I still find it more than strange—

The Deputy Speaker: Your time has expired.

Mrs Witmer: I am pleased to be able to add my comments to the debate on the response to the speech from the throne.

I would like to begin by taking this opportunity to say that I am very honoured to be able to address this House as a representative of the people of Waterloo North and to take the place vacated by my predecessor, Herb Epp. When Mr Epp decided not to seek re-election in August, this Legislature lost a member who served his constituents as well as this province with honour and distinction. It is my sincere hope that I will be able to meet the high standard that he set. I would also like to publicly express my appreciation to him for the support and the co-operation that he demonstrated during the transition period.

I rise today to join those on this side of the House who have expressed their dissatisfaction with the speech that we heard in the chamber last Tuesday. Although there were very high expectations about this government's first throne speech, this government gave absolutely no clear indication of where it intended to go and how fast it intended to get there. Instead, we received a vague set of promises to look into matters and deal with them later, and today we were hearing about moratoriums.

However, I do want to commend the government for not introducing any startling new initiatives. This may indeed be the beginning of the new consultation process which this government has chosen to speak about so frequently. Since specifics were not forthcoming from the throne speech, then obviously there will be other forums and other opportunities to identify priorities, directions and issues that need our attention.

The most important issue facing this province is the economy and the recession we are experiencing. I do not mean to be trite, but unemployment is becoming a growth industry. I would suggest that if this government is truly to represent the workers of this province, it needs to take action in addressing the economy. The action must be taken now.

It is not acceptable for this government to throw up its hands and say it is the fault of the federal government. There are things that the government of Ontario can be doing to help this province's economy recover. They made a commitment during the election to protect employment and this province's prosperity. I am very concerned that they do not appear to be prepared to face up to their responsibility to do so.

Although it is very important to introduce measures to protect workers who have lost their jobs, this must be balanced with the need to create new jobs and the need to remain competitive on the international market. Unfor-

tunately, during the past five years, through overregulation and excessive taxation, Ontario has lost its ability to compete.

We must now make every effort to balance the provincial budget and become more fiscally responsible. The government of Ontario must act to create an economic environment that encourages job creation and provides an attractive investment climate for business in Ontario to grow and prosper. It must offer incentives to businesses to create new jobs. It must encourage them to locate here or expand their existing operations.

Furthermore, this government must participate in the trilateral discussions that are taking place between Mexico, the United States and Canada with regard to free trade. Ontario has a vested interest in these discussions and any subsequent developments. Ontario needs to be involved and be involved now. Jobs are at stake.

There are a number of issues that were mentioned in the throne speech, and some that were not, which are going to increase the cost of doing business in this province. They include employment and pay equity, the increase of the minimum wage, the wage protection fund and the changes to the maternity and parental leave provisions in the Employment Standards Act. They are issues which will have an impact on the economic situation in this province and our ability to compete. They are issues which will cost money, and we must very carefully consider the time lines for the introduction of these new initiatives.

In the throne speech, the government promised to introduce employment equity legislation after a period of consultation. I am pleased to hear that they intend to consult first, because this is an extremely difficult issue. As we have discovered with pay equity, it is not a simple matter to impose legislated answers to the problems of discrimination in the workplace. I hope that the government is indeed serious about public consultation and that it will not simply be a public relations exercise.

1710

I would also urge this government not to rely entirely upon legislation to address this issue. Much more can be done to deal with the barriers to employment that face women, visible minorities, native people and people with disabilities. The education system should be fully utilized to provide them with the skills and training they need to become productive employees.

As well, public awareness campaigns are important in changing attitudes and educating people about the important role we can all make in our society. These initiatives can have an impact on employment equity. Although we can legislate change, we must remember that we will never achieve full and complete employment equity until attitudes change as well.

With regard to pay equity, this government has inherited a system which has failed to have a significant impact on the gap between men's and women's wages. It is expensive, it is time consuming and it has benefited no one more than the pay equity consulting industry.

Although child care workers were mentioned in the throne speech, it did not mention nurses. It is my sincere

hope that the promise to make early progress on redressing unequal pay for child care workers is extended to cover nurses as well.

Again, I would stress that before pay and employment equity legislation is introduced, there is a need for extensive consultation. At a time when we should be making every effort to encourage businesses to locate in Ontario to provide much-needed jobs, the imposition of additional taxes and red tape may well be counterproductive and cost the jobs of those such legislation is intended to help.

I would urge the government to think carefully about its proposal to increase the minimum wage. While wages will increase, it will have a devastating effect on our tourism industry. As well, there may be fewer job opportunities for young people and students. I would caution this government to tread carefully and to consult widely on this minimum wage proposal, to ensure that nobody sinks under in these hard economic times as a result of this initiative.

The throne speech also contains a promise to establish a wage protection fund for workers whose employers declare bankruptcy. Although the details of this program have not been revealed, I would strongly urge the government to reject a payroll tax to fund this proposal. Payroll taxes are taxes on job creation and are completely counterproductive to any efforts to maintain and create jobs in this province.

One issue which the throne speech completely failed to mention is reform of the workers' compensation system. It has become increasingly obvious that this system, which was introduced in 1914, no longer meets the needs of Ontario society in 1990. I hope the government intends to tackle the task of scrapping this outdated system and replacing it with a new, modern and efficient mechanism for compensating injured workers.

The issues I have just discussed all have a significant impact on Ontario's ability to recover from the current economic crisis and our ability to compete. Every day we hear of more and more plant closings; in my own community there have been many—these include Seagram's, Goodrich, Greb and Brox's Old Town Village—as well as layoffs at Ultimate, Raytheon and Budd. This government has a responsibility to provide leadership and to create an economic and investment climate where business can grow and prosper and where jobs can be not only maintained but created.

There are some other issues which the throne speech did not address. Education received only a fleeting comment. There was no mention of how this government intends to respond to the problems facing our colleges, our universities and our school boards. In my riding there are two universities, Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier, as well as a campus of Conestoga College and two school boards. These educational institutions are under considerable financial strain and need immediate attention. Are we simply going to continue to download the cost of educating our children to the local taxpayers, as has been done during the past five years?

Another area that needs immediate attention is our health care system. It is totally inadequate. There are wait-

ing lists for surgery and cancer treatment, and I find it unbelievable that the ministry which spends over one third of the total provincial budget would be completely left out of the throne speech.

Finally, I would like to turn my attention to the environment. I am pleased at the government's promise to introduce a Safe Drinking Water Act. My community, in particular Elmira, has faced a very serious problem with the quality of its drinking water. I am pleased that this government is going to show more leadership and that it is going to be working co-operatively with communities and developing long-range plans to ensure that the citizens of this province will have a reliable and safe supply of water to meet their needs. I look forward to seeing action on this commitment in the future.

Mr Speaker, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my thoughts with the House today. I sincerely hope that this throne speech does indeed mark the beginning of a new consultation process. I look forward very much to working with all members of this House and the citizens of this province in seeking solutions to the problems we face.

Ms Haslam: Congratulations on the member's victory, being elected, and I welcome her also to the House as a new member, as I am a new member.

Employment equity does rely on attitudes, and I am sure both of us realized that in our job searches and in our employment. I commend the honourable member for Waterloo North for bringing this point forward, and I assure members that her request for consultation will be taken seriously in those areas.

The areas she has mentioned are of concern to me also. Indeed, they were part of the reasons I ran for election. I will be raising some of those same concerns with my voice in my caucus. I am pleased to be here, as she is, and I also look forward to working with all members in the House on all of the issues she raised.

Mr Arnott: I want to congratulate the member for Waterloo North on her eloquent and thoughtful presentation. I might also add that some of the members in this chamber may want to emulate her fine example, her class.

Mr Klopp: I would like to congratulate the member for Waterloo North on her maiden speech. As I stood up and applauded her after hearing her comments, I can only know for sure that her roots come back to Huron county. As I listened to her comments and her sincerity, I could only know for sure that many people back in Zurich and in Exeter have said: "Have you met Elizabeth Witmer yet? We grew up with her and I hope you can work with her and get along with her, because she is a good person." I can only say that after hearing those good comments, I am looking forward to that, and I congratulate her.

1720

Mr White: I would also like to welcome the member opposite. Her eloquence is very evident. The concerns that she has mentioned I think are shared by many of us. She mentioned the Workers' Compensation Board, extensively. She probably heard this afternoon of some of the actions we will be taking in that regard. That has certainly been a

thorn in the side of New Democrats for generations, I would say, not merely decades.

The Safe Drinking Water Act, the environmental bill of rights, those issues which she brought up are certainly issues which we are pursuing and which motivated many of us to run.

I have also attended university in her riding. It is really a truly excellent area to come from and she must feel honoured to be its representative. Again, my congratulations.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I would also like to add my congratulations and welcome to the member from Kitchener. I feel that I have had the privilege of knowing this particular individual in a capacity of sharing educational concerns and responsibilities with her. She takes to task anything that is presented to her and I am very happy to hear how her speech includes many new interests and possibilities of study and energy that she will be able to apply her talents to. I know she will do that with the class that has been recognized and with the intellect that she has already shown in today's presentation.

Mrs Witmer: I would simply like to thank members very much for the very kind remarks and to mention once again that I look forward to working with all of the members in this House.

Ms Harrington: I rise to respond to the throne speech on behalf of the citizens of Niagara Falls. I thank the previous speaker for her concern for a very basic issue which I believe in also, and that is the economy and jobs, and for her attitude towards working together.

I would like to pay tribute to the former member from Niagara Falls, Vince Kerrio, the former Minister of Energy and the former Minister of Natural Resources.

Regardless of party stripe, we on all sides of the House share much in common: the long hours, the strain on the family and the travelling. In just two months I have had to travel back and forth on the QEW corridor and I learned quickly to take the public transit option. During the 15 years in the House, Mr Kerrio must have taken at least 1,000 such trips.

I did not know Vince Kerrio 15 years ago; in fact, I did not live in Niagara Falls. But I have heard of the legend of 1975, of the man who defeated a cabinet minister by 500 votes. The legend also says this man knocked on every door in the city of Niagara Falls, or at least he was seen on every street in Niagara Falls. Accounts vary. This past summer I did try, but it is a very hard act to follow.

This man truly was a people person. He, certainly knew a good portion of the city, and most of the people almost felt that he was part of their family. He has been known as Uncle Vince to many people.

Now Niagara Falls enters the new era along with the rest of Ontario. Niagara Falls is unique in many ways. It is of course a world-renowned address and a city of contrasts. Niagara Falls, for instance, has the highest proportion in the region of people with psychiatric disabilities, with a resultant lack of services and with homelessness.

Niagara Falls's downtown commercial street has recently been renovated by the downtown merchants

through the program for renewal, improvement, development and economic revitalization. A formerly decaying Queen Street now has new infrastructure and streetscape, with beautiful lighting and inlaid sidewalks. Yet, with many empty stores, merchants are still hanging on by their fingernails waiting to turn the corner to recovery.

With Niagara Falls, of course one probably first thinks of the beautiful Niagara parks system, the Niagara Escarpment and the Festival of Lights. I would invite the members to come down to Niagara Falls at this particular season and visit with their families. We just turned on the lights this past weekend and it is a beautiful place to be.

Tourism, of course, is a major part of our economy. I must tell the members there is a massive dependence on tourism. The sector employs people largely seasonally, part-time or at minimum wage, and this places a huge burden of instability on our social programs and on our community life.

From the turn of the century, Niagara Falls has also been an industrial base because of the availability of hydro power. Long before this recession, the historical industrial base had a sharp decline. In 1989-90 we lost Sherwood Farms and Gerber, which are both food processors, and had Woodstream and Cyanamid cutdowns. These steady jobs for sometimes unskilled labour are sorely missed in this community. Now increased hydro costs may threaten some of our other industry.

For the social health of this community, Niagara Falls, I believe, needs to balance its industrial sector and its tourism sector with a third side of this triangle—commercial office space. After many years of feeling distant from Queen's Park, Niagara Falls needs to become more a part of Ontario and our Ontario government.

There are certain problems associated with being so close to the border. So I welcome the move of the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation. I truly believe our community would and will benefit exceptionally from the balance and stability that this third sector will bring. I know the pulse of this city. The industry managers, the labour movement, the social service providers, those struggling to get by, the tourism operators, the local merchants, and even city council, with whom I have spent many happy hours, all would benefit from the revitalizing ripple effect of a more stable economy.

If there is one thing I want to do in my career as an MPP, it is to improve the economic health of our city and help bring these divergent sectors together.

I appreciate the encouragement from across the floor on many of the items that have been mentioned. I appreciate the encouragement to fulfil our agenda. I most sincerely hope that over the next four to five years we will be productive together and will work co-operatively. I look forward to sharing ideas with the many thoughtful and concerned members of this assembly and to learn from the more experienced here.

I must tell the members, though, that I was told quite sincerely by another experienced member that this House was a club. I thought about that: a club. He also described question period as a game. I believe you certainly have to

enjoy it here. You have to work together and you have to get along, but I reject totally the notion that this is a club.

Our responsibility often involves difficult decisions, and that is where the setting of priorities comes in. That setting of priorities is what is called leadership, and there can be no doubt that Ontarians are searching for leadership as never before. We must state clearly where we want to go, what we want to achieve and never sway from that course.

Our party, in the throne speech, has made commitments to the people of Ontario and they are firmly based on the principles of fairness and justice. For example, the government's proposal to spend \$700 million to try to protect our economy and our people from the repercussions of the recession is one example.

In Niagara Falls, as I am sure in many other places, we have a huge problem with infrastructure. I found our council having to struggle with these decisions of whether we can use our sewage capacity to redevelop a hotel or to put in non-profit housing. These are the kinds of decisions that are being faced. In fact, \$50 million is needed to correct the combined sewer system in Niagara Falls, and in the meanwhile overflows are going directly into the Niagara River.

1730

Similarly, our government's plans to help protect workers by tough legislation on plant closings and pension reforms stem from the same belief that people are not objects to be used up and then thrown away. As the previous member indicated, they do deserve a job and not unemployment. The economy must serve man and not man the economy.

Our government has also committed this House to, and I quote from the throne speech, "deal resolutely with violence against women and children. It is time for society to come face to face with this reality." Those are tough words. Those are strong words. In fact, last Friday morning I was on the local talk show, the infamous talk show, and the host asked me: "How is the government going to do that? You say you are going to effect change with regard to violence against women." I had to stop and think. There is no easy answer, of course. It will require all of us here in this House to work together to confront what is a very difficult, ugly and very sensitive subject.

I would like to give you two examples. A couple of weeks ago in Niagara Falls we held a public forum on women's issues and the speaker was a woman named Maude Barlow. She is involved mainly, I believe, in talking to teachers and students across this province. She described a situation that struck me very much, and I would like to share it with you. She said that she was talking in a community in Ontario, and I hope it was an isolated community. She described a teenage girl who happened to be engaged who said the following things after Ms Barlow's talk. She said: "My father beats my mother. My uncle beats my aunt. My grandfather beats my grandmother. I did not know there was any other way." A desperate, hopeless but a real situation.

Of course, there are all kinds of other situations like this, but what is woman abuse? It is a soul-destroying

subordination. It is a loss of control of one's life. It is a loss of dignity. It is a feeling of entrapment and powerlessness. It is the horror of living with the constant fear of violence.

Abuse has many forms. First of all, we think of physical abuse, which is the most obvious, from a slap or a shove to assault with a weapon or murder. Even a minor form of assault must be taken very seriously, because it brings increasing physical force. In fact, each week in Canada two women are killed by their male partner. Another form of abuse is threatening: "If you tell anyone, if you call the police or testify against me in court, I will kill you. I will take your children." Another form of abuse is emotional hurt, publicly or privately putting a person down, such as: "You're a lousy wife. You're a lousy lover." Ridicule of accomplishments effectively erodes a person's self-esteem and self-confidence. Women, too, may be told that they are crazy and need psychiatric care.

Last, I want to tell members that women abuse is child abuse too. Children who witness this obviously feel confused, they feel guilty and they feel frightened. They may often become withdrawn, disobedient or aggressive. Emotional hurt often is worse than physical abuse. Medical problems develop by living under great stress.

Women who use the shelter services are beaten an average of 35 times before seeking help. Many have been in these relationships for many years. Some, until their children become independent, feel they have to stay there. Many are led to believe they cause the abuse, it is their fault. They are ashamed, they feel guilty. Some accept their treatment as normal. Many have been misunderstood when they tried to reach out for help.

In the 18th century, in British common law, a husband could use physical force to keep control. In fact, he could use a switch or a stick that was no broader than the width of his thumb. That is where we get the saying, "the rule of thumb." Even when you think of the comment, "A man's home is his castle," there is cause for concern, I believe.

The only way to get to the root of violence—and I thought about that this weekend, as I was asked on the talk show—is to try to change attitudes. That, of course, is the most difficult thing anyone could do, much less politicians. But as a government committed to fairness and committed to trying to keep our commitment to leadership, we must do our part to try to change these attitudes. How? First of all by example; second, by promotion; and third, by legislation.

I ask this House to realize that there are many images around us which contribute to this attitude towards women. We do not have to go back 50 years, we do not have to go back to the 18th century: There are still many cultural forces which subtly or blatantly impact on women's self-image as they are growing up and the attitudes of others towards women. These images and forces range everywhere in our lives, whether in fairy tales, in advertising, in beauty pageants or in pornography.

Next week, 6 December, is the anniversary of the Montreal massacre where, as members know, 14 women engineering students were murdered. I ask that members of this House mark the day solemnly together.

The commitment of this government to its goals must proceed slowly and surely, the goals towards equality and fairness for women, towards equality and fairness for workers, towards a sustainable economy and towards an environment we can pass on to our children with pride. How do we do this? We look at the throne speech: By increasing the minimum wage to 60% of the industrial wage, by introducing pension reforms, by revising rent review, by expanding the supply of affordable housing, by extending child care, by continuing the reform of the Social Assistance Review Committee, by ensuring that support and custody orders are enforced, by expanding public transit, by a real conserving of energy and by dealing with waste in many new ways. The environment, the economy, social services, a new deal for women—all need tough leadership. I think the way ahead is clear.

1740

Mr Phillips: I appreciate the thoughtful comments by the member. I would just remind the member that in terms of commitment, there was another commitment made, and I think it is important that none of us forget. That was the Agenda for People. I think that was perhaps the most solemn commitment, because in terms of consultation, we consulted all of the people and they chose to support the Agenda for People. So I realize that the speech from the throne is one of the commitments, but there is a more important commitment perhaps, and that is the Agenda for People.

I would suggest that in terms of integrity and the way I think the people of Ontario will judge integrity, it will be on the basis on which this plan is implemented. I would just say to the members, and particularly to the caucus across the way, that they should keep this document before them all the time, because in four or five years it will be the document that will be pulled out and the integrity of the party opposite will be measured. Certainly as I look at the speech from the throne, I think there is the possibility of some conflict there. I think the party will have to be awfully careful that it does not begin to back off that agenda.

In the member's remarks, which I thought were very thoughtful, she mentioned commitment. I think there are two commitments, and this perhaps is the more important one than the speech from the throne. Certainly the people of Ontario will be watching as we move through the next few months and years for the government's fulfilment of that agenda.

Mr Martin: I would perhaps remind the member for Scarborough-Agincourt that in fact what we are doing here is debating the speech from the throne.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): Yes, and please address your comments to your colleague's presentation.

Mr Martin: I would also like to congratulate the member for a very eloquent and thoughtful and feeling speech. It was certainly well received by me. Because of that, I am very much looking forward to the kinds of things that we will do in this Legislature flowing from the speech from the throne, because we have members like her

here to ensure that we do in fact speak to and meet the needs of people in Ontario.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I certainly would like to congratulate the member for Niagara Falls on the way in which she has so seriously brought family violence and indeed violence against women and children to the floor of this Legislature. I think that has to be done on a very regular basis. We certainly do have to remind ourselves and those we represent about that autocracy as often as possible.

I hope that she will have her request granted and that the House leaders will consider our recognizing 6 December as a day on which we must stop and remember the greatest tragedy that Canada has seen.

Ms Harrington: Thank you very much, to other members of the House. I certainly look forward to working with everyone here, and appreciate their support.

Mr Chiarelli: First of all, Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your re-election and on your appointment to your responsibilities in the chair. I am sure that you will perform those responsibilities with grace, honour, firmness and your usual dignity.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the people of Ottawa West for re-electing me to this Legislature. I am honoured and privileged to be able to represent them. Ottawa West is an informed riding. It is a riding with active community people, and I certainly hope I can continue to do a reasonably good job, if not an exceptional job, for the residents of Ottawa West. From Michele Heights to McKellar Heights, Ottawa West is a good place to live and I want to work to keep it that way.

I want to also thank the people of Ottawa and area generally for returning so many Liberals to Queen's Park. I am happy to be sharing my responsibilities with the colleagues that I do have. I think particularly the Ottawa-Carleton caucus performed well over the last three and a half years, and I am looking forward to another four or five years of sharing responsibilities with them.

However, we did lose one seat, that being Ottawa Centre to the Honourable Evelyn Gigantes. She is replacing Richard Patten, who was a minister in the last government, and I do want to publicly compliment Mr Patten for the services that he provided to the riding. He was an honourable, hardworking member. He opened his heart and his talents to the riding, and I wish him success in the future, and I wish him all the more success about four or five years from now when he is renominated and takes on Mrs Gigantes again.

Speaking of Mrs Gigantes, I will say something nice. The House leader aside says, "Say something nice about Evelyn." I will say something nice and perhaps something not so nice. When the dust settled in the Ottawa-Carleton area there was a realization that we had one New Democratic Party member, one minister in government, representing essentially all of Ontario east of Kingston. A lot of people thought that would be a very onerous job, which it certainly is, but the question was, would the minister be able to work with so many Liberals from the area and several Conservatives, and would she co-operate and share some of the responsibilities with us? She is on public

record, quoted a number of times in the media, as having said that yes, she will consult with us as much as possible, she will try to share the responsibilities with us. She made that promise personally to some of our members of the Ottawa-Carleton caucus.

Early in October I endeavoured to get in touch with the minister on two occasions by phone, and I received no return phone call. On 16 October 1990 I sent a letter to the minister. It was hand-delivered to her office here at Queen's Park by my executive assistant, and I would like to read that letter for the public record.

"Dear Minister:

"I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election victory and subsequent appointment to the Health portfolio. As Minister of Health the job promises to be an onerous one, and I wish you every success. Now that the dust has settled I would like to meet with you at the earliest possible opportunity to discuss some specific and some general issues of interest to the people of Ottawa-Carleton. In this regard, I would appreciate it if you would be so kind as to have your staff set up an appointment at your convenience."

That was six weeks ago. I have received no response and no acknowledgement from the minister. Last week I introduced a private member's public bill into this Legislature dealing with regional government reform and the election of the regional chairman at large. I very much would have appreciated the opportunity to discuss this bill with Mrs Gigantes, the regional minister, and I had no opportunity to do so. I proceeded in the absence of consultation because the minister was not available to consult and there was no response to my letter of six weeks ago to give any consultation whatsoever. I am told that the same applies to other members from the area.

I would also like to point out that I have been advised by a number of people from the Ottawa-Carleton area—individuals, special-interest groups—that they have no access. Their phone calls are not being returned and their briefs and their letters are not being responded to. We have a new minister and we have a new government, and I would like to give her the benefit of the doubt, the opportunity to come through on her promises to consult and be available to us in Ottawa-Carleton. I would hope that in the future she would follow through on her promises and do something to work co-operatively with the members.

1750

One of the other issues that I did want to speak to the minister about is the issue that I am going to talk about today. It is a very serious issue, one that I think is non-partisan. It has to do with one factor, one issue, in the Health ministry.

I am referring to the issue of long-term care psychiatric beds in Ottawa-Carleton. I do want to say something that I think the members here will find quite astounding, and that is that the Ottawa-Carleton region, with a population of some 605,000 people, does not have one single long-term care psychiatric bed. I am going to say it again for everybody in this House today: It does not have one long-term psychiatric bed.

I will address the fact that Liberals were in government. I was re-elected to this House, and I was re-elected because

I did some things well, I did some things on a mediocre basis and I did some things not so well. I think one of the failures of my first three-year term is a failure partially on my part, but it is a collective failure. It was a failure of the ministry, it was a failure of the previous minister and it was a failure of myself and the representatives from Ottawa-Carleton because we did not effect change when change should have been effected.

I want to refer to some of the work that I did unsuccessfully in my first term and I hope that I am successful and I hope that people in this House and in the ministry and my colleagues will help me to be successful this time around.

I want to refer first to a letter that I sent to the then Minister of Health, the member for Oriole, in May 1988, following on a meeting that was held at the Royal Ottawa Hospital in Ottawa, in my riding, in April 1988. I am going to refer only to a portion of that particular letter:

"However, I am sure that you have observed a sense of disappointment concerning your statement that no beds will be forthcoming for the permanently psychiatrically disabled. I too am disappointed that the ministry does not have any immediate or long-term plans to provide permanent beds in an expanding community of over 600,000 people. We can only say that we see the ministry's position on this problem as a challenge which will some day become an opportunity and I look forward to working with officials of the Royal Ottawa Hospital and the district health council to create circumstances whereby our community can provide the beds we feel are urgently necessary."

Before I go any further, I want to use an analogy to Metropolitan Toronto. What I am talking about is the question of mentally disabled, mentally ill people, if they lived in Metropolitan Toronto, having to go to Trenton, Ontario, to the east for medical treatment and for hospitalization or having to go perhaps to Woodstock in the west, which is totally unacceptable in today's day and age.

I endeavoured to enlist some assistance from medical people in the Ottawa-Carleton area and I did enlist the assistance of Dr Y.D. Lapierre who was the psychiatrist-in-chief, professor and chairman at University of Ottawa school of medicine. He did some research and investigations at my request. After I received that information, which I will refer to in a minute, I wrote a letter to the then Minister of Health, which I will read.

"Re: Ottawa-Carleton area, non-existence of long-term treatment beds for psychiatric patients.

"You will recall that when you recently attended the Royal Ottawa Hospital, senior medical and administrative staff and I expressed strong concern that a metropolitan area in the province of Ontario serving 600,000 residents had no long-term treatment beds for psychiatric patients.

"At my request, Dr Y. D. Lapierre, psychiatrist-in-chief, surveyed Canada to determine if any other similar metropolitan area suffered the same lack of facilities. I enclose Dr Lapierre's letter of 13 June 1988 together with his survey. Dr Lapierre concluded that in the Ottawa-Carleton area 'We are indeed the only centre in the half-million population bracket which does not have a facility for a longer-term treatment for psychiatric patients.'

"As an MPP from the Ottawa-Carleton area, I find this state unacceptable and I am determined to be a catalyst within the community and within our government to create a collective and co-operative solution to this deficiency."

As the minister may be aware, I met with her parliamentary assistant and the executive director of the Royal Ottawa Hospital, George Langill, several weeks ago to discuss possible solutions to this problem. No solutions were forthcoming. I want to refer to Dr Lapierre's letter again and repeat one quote from his letter: "I would suggest that we are indeed the only centre in the half-million population bracket which does not have a facility for longer-term treatment for psychiatric patients."

He refers to a survey. He has a list of cities and the number of long-term psychiatric beds they have. He refers to Calgary with 400, Saskatoon with 200, Regina with 200, Winnipeg with 400, Toronto with 585, Whitby with 435, Hamilton with 450 and Kingston with 410; Ottawa-Carleton: none.

The families of our mentally ill, long-term patients have to travel 90 miles to visit their loved ones, almost as far as Montreal. It is unacceptable in today's day and age. Dr Lapierre's figures and surveys have not been contradicted in any way by the ministry.

That letter, which I sent to the minister in June 1988, was responded to in January 1989. The minister's response refers in the first instance to the situation with short-term or crisis beds, which was not the subject of my letter. In the second instance, the minister's response referred to bed ratio issues with respect to crisis or short-term beds. It did not respond to the issue of long-term psychiatric beds.

The minister said, and I will quote her: "With regard to the Ottawa-Carleton area, there are several factors that have influenced the situation in Ottawa. The number of psychiatrists is almost double the provincial average, and many long-term patients are being treated in Ottawa-Carleton who could be transferred to Brockville Psychiatric Hospital. The Royal Ottawa Hospital should transfer patients to Brockville for long-term care. These factors have led to the relatively high occupancy rates of hospitals in Ottawa."

A Minister of Health has a very heavy responsibility and relies very heavily on the information that is provided by the officials. In this case, the officials in the ministry failed the minister by not providing the proper information. I once again went to Dr Lapierre. He provided a detailed response, that the information the ministry had provided to the minister was absolutely incorrect about the number of psychiatrists we have in Ottawa-Carleton. In fact, he indicated that other municipalities in Ontario have a higher number of psychiatrists per capita.

With respect to the information that was provided to the minister on Ottawa-Carleton not utilizing the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital, the Royal Ottawa Hospital provided an answer for me. It indicated, and I am quoting—

The Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the member would like to adjourn the debate.

On motion by Mr Chiarelli, the debate was adjourned.
The House adjourned at 1759.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Wednesday 28 November 1990

Members' statements

Agricultural industry	2241
Mr Cleary	
Durham Art Gallery	2241
Mr B. Murdoch	
Riding of Kitchener-Wilmot	2241
Mr Cooper	
Technical education	2241
Mrs Y. O'Neill	
SkyDome	2242
Mr Stockwell	
Nuclear weapons	2242
Mr Frankford	
Elliot Lake	2242
Mr Brown	
Zebra mussels	2242
Mr MacLean	
Charles Tatham	2243
Mr Sutherland	

Statement by the ministry

Rent regulation	2243
Mr Cooke	

Responses

Rent regulation	2244
Ms Poole	
Mr Curling	
Mr Tilson	
Mr Stockwell	

Oral questions

Layoffs	2245
Mr Nixon	
Mr Mackenzie	
Developmentally disabled	2246
Mrs McLeod	
Mrs Akande	
Mr Jackson	
Mr Rae	
Rent regulation	2249
Mr Tilson	
Mr Cooke	
Ms Poole	
Protection of in-care residents	2250
Mrs Marland	
Ms Ziemba	
Workers' Compensation Board	2251
Mr Huget	
Mr Mackenzie	

Minimum wage	2251
Mr Offer	
Mr Mackenzie	
Market value reassessment	2252
Mr Turnbull	
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Accessibility for the disabled	2252
Mr Owens	
Mr Philip	
Waste management	2253
Mr Mahoney	
Mr Rae	
Ontario Provincial Police	2253
Mr Carr	
Mr Farnan	

Petitions

Capital funding for schools	2254
Mrs Sullivan	
Gasoline prices	2254
Mr Wood	

First readings

Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1990,	
Bill 4	2254
Mr Cooke	
Agreed to	2254
Interlock People Ltd Act, 1990, Bill Pr17	2254
Mrs Cunningham	
Agreed to	2254

Government motion

Committee size	2254
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	2254
Committee membership	2254
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	2255
Committee schedule	2255
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	2255

Throne speech debate

Resuming the adjourned debate	2255
Mrs Marland	2255
Mr Henderson	2257
Mrs Carter	2257
Mr Conway	2260
Mr Elston	2260
Mr Scott	2260
Mrs Sullivan	2260

Mrs McLeod	2261	Mrs Witmer	2268
Mr McGuinty	2261	Ms Haslam	2270
Mr White	2262	Ms Harrington	2270
Mr Beer	2262	Mr Phillips	2272
Mrs Cunningham	2262	Adjourned	2274
Mr Chiarelli	2263		
Mr Tilson	2263	Other business	
Mr Mammoliti	2264		
Mr Turnbull	2265	Visitor	2245
Mr Bisson	2265	The Speaker	
Mr Hope	2265	Adjournment	2274
Mrs Y. O'Neill	2266		
Mr Mahoney	2267	Lists of members	
Mr Sutherland	2267		
Mr Martin	2268	Members and their responsibilities	2275

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 28 novembre 1990

Discours du trône

Suite du débat ajourné	2255
M. McGuinty	2262
M. Beer	2262
M. Bisson	2265



62 1990

62 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Thursday 29 November 1990

Le jeudi 29 novembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 29 November 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon Ms Lankin: I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

The Speaker: I have received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

CRAWFORD ROSE

Mr Beer: In the past week in the town of Aurora, Ontario lost an exemplary citizen. Dr Crawford Rose was one of those selfless people who labour tirelessly for their community throughout their lives, often with little or no public recognition. He died last week at the age of 92, after a long and full life of helping others. He was celebrated in and around Aurora, not only because of the good work that he carried out but also because he was such a genuinely caring person.

Dr Rose and his family came to Aurora in 1942. In addition to his medical practice, Dr Rose also took part in political life. He was elected to city council in 1943 and served as mayor of Aurora from 1950 until 1955.

Some seven years ago the Rose family decided to sell its home to the board of the Yellow Brick House, a shelter for abused women and their children. Dr Rose took great pride in knowing that his former home was to be used to help those vulnerable women and children who needed a safe haven from violence. His spirit and dedication are reflected in the work of the Yellow Brick House today.

Dr Rose also had a long and productive relationship with York County Hospital in Newmarket. He was granted a lifetime membership with the hospital and wrote a book entitled York County Hospital: A Story of Faith. The book was dedicated to his wife, Julia, who died 13 years ago. In 1976 Dr Rose was also named Aurora's Citizen of the Year.

Dr Rose brought happiness to many people with his help and assistance. He was the kind of doctor who made house calls and the kind of person who made people happier just by the enthusiasm with which he lived his own life. Crawford Rose was a kind and gentle person, always willing to help the people around him. We will all miss him.

LAYOFFS

Mr J. Wilson: My statement is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. In a press release issued last week concerning the sale of Harding Carpets to Soreltext, Ontario Development Corp officials said the phasing back in of Harding's Collingwood plant is under review.

Although I appreciate the minister's efforts to date on behalf of Harding Carpets, any sale which involves public

money and does not guarantee jobs for Collingwood workers is unacceptable. Layoffs are occurring across the province, but the Collingwood situation is unique. Within the span of a year, the town has been forced to look on in horror as one third of its workforce joined the unemployment rolls courtesy of industrial layoffs.

The economic and social repercussions of this industrial downturn have been profound. As I am sure the minister is aware, after reading the numerous letters I have sent to his office asking him to address this problem, last week's sale of Harding Carpets guaranteed jobs for workers at the plant in Brantford. My understanding, however, is that the sale is not yet finalized, and I am asking the minister today to provide workers in Collingwood with the same guarantee of jobs that Brantford workers received. I would also ask the minister to provide a timetable as to when Collingwood workers can expect to be back on the job. It is unfair and immoral for workers recently devastated by a layoff to be left dangling as to what their fate entails.

TOWN OF EAST GWILLIMBURY

Mr O'Connor: It is with great pleasure that I speak today. The honour to represent the people of Durham-York in the first ever New Democrat government in Ontario as the first New Democrat elected in my riding is indeed a humbling experience.

With a large rural riding like Durham-York, I have found warmth and the willingness to help a neighbour that is quite easily overlooked in large urban areas.

Last Friday night I had the unique opportunity of being part of the opening of the new East Gwillimbury Civic Centre in Sharon. Last night I returned to the new civic centre to the town of East Gwillimbury's volunteer appreciation night. The East Gwillimbury Recreation Committee presented an award to Gail Roy as the Volunteer of the Year and also presented Ted Dodds with the Outstanding Volunteer Award.

As part of the evening's events, retired assistant deputy minister for recreation Bob Secord spoke of the importance and value of good municipal recreation programming. The highlight of the evening was the recognition of the efforts and accomplishments of a local councillor, Paul Mainprize, and to honour Mr Mainprize with the Corps d'Elite Certificate of Recognition on behalf of the southern region of the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation. He has added much not only to local recreation but also as a regional vice-president in the Ontario Municipal Recreation Association.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Mr McGuinty: I am concerned about the NDP government's apparent lack of commitment to the integrity of the independent environmental assessment process. The previous government established this independent process,

with funding for public interest groups, to review Ontario's electricity needs for the next 25 years.

Comments in recent days by the Minister of Energy, and specifically in response to my question of 22 November, have left the clear perception that the relevance and independence of the Environmental Assessment Board is being eroded and is in question.

In lieu of her statements regarding the future of nuclear energy in this province, the minister had two responsible courses of action open to her. She could have asked Hydro to amend its plans to make the non-nuclear option one of Hydro's top three preferences before the board or she could have directed her ministry to make a constructive contribution within the hearing process. Instead, the minister seems to have been gripped by NDP moratorium fever.

Why does the minister continue to prejudge the outcome of this independent and rigorous process? Does the minister realize what kind of precedent she is setting with regard to the independence of the entire environmental assessment process?

From the larger perspective, what is in question here is this government's commitment to a respect for due process. It is one thing for this government to pronounce on matters of policy, but it is another thing for such pronouncement to be perceived as an interference with due process.

AIR QUALITY

Mr Carr: My statement is on the Petro-Canada oil refinery. The Petro-Canada oil refinery has in the last five years been the object of concern and anger for many residents and ratepayers in my riding. They question the quality of the air emissions from the plant which are, at the very best, smelly and obnoxious and which may even be toxic. There is no doubt that these odours affect the quality of life for the people living in the area, and there is a high level of discomfort.

Despite numerous telephone calls and written requests for an appointment with the Minister of the Environment, I have not been able to meet with her to discuss this matter.

Both the Premier and the minister are aware of the situation, having been informed by various residents, former members of Parliament and ministry officials. I realize that the minister is concerned with high-profile issues such as the garbage crisis and the 3Rs, but possible toxic air emissions are emissions which affect the health and comfort of the people now, and this is an issue which should be taken seriously.

There is a public meeting on 13 December at the Queen Elizabeth Park School in Oakville and I invite the minister to attend. It would give her a chance to convey to the residents in the vicinity of the plant both her concern and the assurance that she will act to ensure that they live in clean, unfouled air, which should be their right.

1340

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Morrow: Mr Speaker, I wish to extend to you my congratulations on your historic election.

I thank the constituents of Wentworth East for electing me as their representative to this great Legislature. The riding of Wentworth East consists of the township of Glanbrook, the city of Stoney Creek and portions of the east end of the city of Hamilton. This region is one of the fastest-growing areas of the province. As a result of this growing population, there is an increased demand for many provincial government services.

The east end of Hamilton and Stoney Creek area of my riding have been neglected for years with respect to adequate health care services.

In the near future, the St Joseph's Community Health Centre will be opening in my riding to meet the needs of these people. I have recently toured the centre and was quite impressed. The facilities are excellent. The residents of this community will be able to take great pride in them. This health care centre is unique in the province as it will be very much a community centre and will rely a great deal on the participation of volunteers. I believe facilities such as these deserve the funding to make them a success.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my predecessor, Shirley Collins. I thank her for the work she has done over the past three years.

It is a great honour to be a member of this House. I look forward to working with all the members of this Legislature to help make this province a better place to live in.

DRUG ABUSE

Mr Ruprecht: In the next few weeks the Parkdale Focus Group for a Drug-Free Neighbourhood will be meeting with interested persons to discuss how our community can take back the streets and rid itself of drug pushers and those who are undesirable in the community.

There have been a number of community groups across Ontario, and a number of municipalities, which have made recommendations to the Solicitor General and the Premier—in fact, to this government. I can think of a number of groups that are local to our area, such as the Bloor-Lansdowne Committee Against Drugs, the Parkdale Schools-Community Anti-Drug Committee and, as I mentioned earlier, the newly established focus group against drugs.

Our citizens are expecting that the new social contract this government is talking about will include a specific blueprint of action. That would necessarily mean that the recommendations that have come to this government should be at least somewhat implemented.

I can think of the recommendations made by Metropolitan Toronto council. I can think of the recommendations made by the city of Toronto anti-drug committee with Mr O'Donohue and Chris Korwin-Kuczynski at the head. I can think of recommendations that have been made by local organizations. What we are asking for here is to find out just when this Solicitor General and this government will act in order that we, as residents, and the rest of Ontario will be able to take back our streets.

LIVING WILLS

Mr Sterling: This afternoon I intend to introduce two complementary private member's bills, one called the Natural Death Act and the other An Act to amend the Powers of Attorney Act.

These bills deal with life-sustaining medical treatment decisions for the incapacitated terminally ill patient being kept alive indefinitely by artificial means. The Durable Power of Attorney Act deals with transferring a person's authority with respect to medical care decisions to another specified individual if the first person should become incapacitated. The Natural Death Act provides a less formal procedure, but it too is done with the informed consent of the individual. Through a living will, an individual can state in writing that if a terminal or irreversible condition occurs and he is incapacitated and cannot communicate, then treatment should be discontinued.

These bills are supported by the Canadian Dying with Dignity Association, the Alzheimer Society, and people who work in the medical profession and with AIDS patients, because modern medical technology has outpaced our body of laws and social realities.

These bills are not new to this Legislature. I introduced both of them during the 34th Parliament. Even though they were, for the most part, welcomed by the citizens of Ontario, the government of that day, while supporting one of the bills, blocked it from going to committee for further discussion. I hope this new government will not be so intent on playing partisan political games with such a sensitive issue.

CHILD CARE

Ms Haslam: I have chosen to talk today on an issue that I feel is very important. I would like to speak for the Marys, aged four; the Billys, aged two, and the Jennys, aged three, who die each year because parents have to take children to work and those parents work in an industry where heavy machinery is a necessity. Children are frequently found in this workplace because child care is not available.

I am speaking about farms and farm accidents. Farm accidents are a tragedy, especially when they result in a death and especially when the fatality involves a child. The number of children who have died in farm accidents this year averages one every five and a half weeks. As recently as last weekend, a child in my riding died in a farm accident.

Our rural areas need a viable system of day care. I am pleased to hear that the Ministry of Community and Social Services will be examining day care programs and targeting the north and rural areas. I look forward to a time when at the end of five and a half weeks there is no statistic of another child's death due to a farm accident.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

PROTECTION OF IN-CARE RESIDENTS

Hon Ms Ziemba: Today on behalf of the Premier I am very pleased to announce the appointment of Ernie Lightman as a commissioner to inquire into unregulated

residential facilities in the province and to conduct a census of the vulnerable adults housed in these facilities.

This appointment is consistent with a key recommendation of the coroner's jury report on the death of Joseph Kendall. The report was released on 27 November 1990, just two days ago. The coroner's inquest into the death has revealed the appalling conditions in which some vulnerable adults live in this province.

In May 1985 Joseph Kendall was discharged from the Queen Street Mental Health Centre in Toronto to Cedar Glen Boarding Home in Orillia, a privately run home for ex-psychiatric patients and people with developmental disabilities. In November 1987 Mr Kendall died in hospital after he was assaulted at Cedar Glen.

This government will no longer tolerate such treatment as that suffered by Mr Kendall.

I am requesting that an initial assessment be provided by the commissioner after three months and that a final report and recommendations be completed after six months. As soon as possible thereafter I will share with the members of the Legislature what further action will be taken by our government to address these problems.

I am very pleased to announce that Mr Lightman is in the gallery today. Mr Lightman is an economist in the faculty of social work at the University of Toronto. He brings technical expertise and long-standing involvement in social service and public policy issues to this position. Mr Lightman holds a PhD in economics from the University of California at Berkeley and spent two years as a faculty member at the London School of Economics.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Hon Mrs Akande: This afternoon I would like to inform the House of this government's plans for addressing poverty in Ontario. This issue must be addressed interministerially. Today, I want to talk about four steps.

First, the government plans to accelerate the process of social assistance reform in Ontario. The foundation of this reform is the recommendations of the Social Assistance Review Committee in its report entitled *Transitions*. As stated in the speech from the throne, we are committed to reform of Ontario's social assistance system, and that includes a commitment to the major directions of the SARC recommendations. They provide the solutions that we must put into practice.

To accelerate this reform process, I have asked the Advisory Group on New Social Assistance Legislation, established six months ago by my predecessor, to fast-track its work. This government has funded it to do so. I have requested that the group report back to me in January 1991 with advice on those recommendations of SARC that could be implemented without legislative change. Its advice would be in time for consideration in the spring budget. As for the recommendations from *Transitions* that do require changes in social assistance legislation, I have further asked that the advisory group report back to me by the middle of next year with a blueprint.

1350

As I pointed out earlier, several recommendations from the SARC report go beyond the jurisdiction of my minis-

try. For this reason, a committee of relevant ministries will be established to co-ordinate the implementation of these recommendations in a comprehensive approach to addressing poverty. This committee will be led by the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Second, while the reform of Ontario's social assistance legislation will take place throughout 1991, there is one very important step this government is going to take quickly to increase the incomes of all recipients of social assistance. My ministry will improve the previously announced social assistance rate increases that are effective 1 January 1991. Put simply, we have decided to increase the increases.

Instead of the 5% increase in basic allowances, the increase will now be 7%, and the increase in shelter ceilings will be boosted from 5% to 10%. These improvements will add another \$91 million to social assistance benefits in 1991-92. For a single parent with two children, the impact of the January increases will result in up to an additional \$104 a month.

Third, we realize that municipalities will pay 20% of the cost of general welfare assistance. They have not been given advance notice of this improvement of the previously announced rate increases. For that reason, for the 1991 calendar year only, the province will pay the estimated \$7.4 million municipal share of the additional 2% in basic allowances and the additional 5% in shelter ceilings.

Fourth, this government will draw upon a \$54-million fund announced by the previous government but never used. This funding will support employment programs for people receiving social assistance and for people with disabilities. This will involve a wide range of services that will focus on preparing and training people for jobs as well as creating work opportunities that will lead to permanent employment. The fund also helps with employment-related expenses such as child care for single parents or assistive devices for people who are physically disabled.

I believe these are all important and significant steps that demonstrate this government's commitment to address poverty in Ontario. This is real social assistance reform, making the system more fair for more people. Our determined course of action transforms a series of recommendations from words on paper to improvements in the quality of people's lives.

RESPONSES

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Beer: May I, on behalf of my party, state very simply that we welcome and support the minister's announcement today. This will have a real effect in helping those who are on social assistance, and I think everyone can take great solace from that.

I think it is important to note that these reforms the minister has announced build on a very solid foundation which the previous government brought in through the beginnings of the Social Assistance Review Committee, through the work of George Thomson and his colleagues. In 1989, as honourable members will recall, we brought

forward some \$415 million to provide direct and real help to those on social assistance.

Earlier this year, we set up the committee which the honourable minister has referred to, to look at bringing in new social assistance legislation, which in the SARC report had been underlined as being critical, so that we could enter the 1990s with legislation that would adequately deal with the kinds of problems those on social assistance face.

I want to say that the whole question of the rates that are received by those on social assistance is a key one in the work which the committee is going to do, and I applaud the initiative that this committee has been asked to fast-track a number of these issues, because clearly the problems, even over the last six months, have become greater. It is going to be very important to look at issues such as adequacy. How do we go about determining what indeed are adequate and fair rates? I think that will be an important question for the committee to deal with.

I think one of the key things that the minister is going to have to deal with is how to effectively develop employment programs so that those on social assistance can get off social assistance. As George Thomson said in his report, one of the things that the people on assistance kept saying was, "Help us break down the barriers so that in fact we can gain useful employment."

The supports to employment program, STEP, which we brought in a year ago, has, as I think the minister knows, produced some real benefits in that some 80% of those individuals receiving social assistance now see higher levels of earnings than they did before. We want to continue with that because it is in everyone's interest that those who can work and want to get back into the workforce will be able to take advantage of the various work programs that will be developed.

I recognize that the Ministry of Community and Social Services cannot do that by itself. It needs to work with the other ministries. My only caution to the minister is that I think, as the lead ministry, it is terribly important that she ensure the work of that committee proceeds at a rapid pace, so that the kinds of programs that are required will be put into place.

I think also that, as the minister is looking at other areas that need to be altered and changed, one of the ones that we felt required a very close look and action was that of the children's benefit. This again was mentioned in the SARC report. Some work has already been done on it.

I have raised that with social service ministers across the country and with the federal minister, because I think, recognizing the number of children who in fact are receiving social assistance, we have to find better ways of dealing with child poverty, and a children's benefit is one of them.

I am glad to see that the minister is going to be funding the municipal share in 1991. That is important. I would ask her simply to move as expeditiously as possible with the provincial-municipal social services review.

I end as I began. We welcome these changes. They will make a difference, and we will work closely with the government to ensure that further changes are made.

PROTECTION OF IN-CARE RESIDENTS

Mr Phillips: I would like to respond to the statement by the Minister of Citizenship, to lend our support overall to the statement, but to have one suggestion, if we might. I think it is a good move, the appointment of this particular individual. I do not know Mr Lightman myself, but I am told he is an excellent individual who by all accounts will do a fine job.

An Agenda for People did spell out the intent of the government to establish in law regulations around this area. I might suggest we could make Mr Lightman's work more effective if we gave him that as the direction, that it would be the intent of the government to establish in law regulations and that that should be part of his explicit instructions in terms of his study. But overall we are in support of it and we would make that one suggestion.

1400

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Jackson: I was pleased, as all members in the House were today, to have an opportunity to read in the Toronto Star the minister's announcement. I am starting to believe that, like the former government, we are going to be seeing an increased number of these announcements through the pages of the Toronto Star. If that is the case, perhaps the Speaker might be interested in renaming ministerial responses as Letters to the Editor.

However, on that point I wish to suggest that on the issue of the support for the poor people of this province, there is absolute unanimity from all three political parties represented in this House. I think all parties have distinguished themselves on the issue of support for the Social Assistance Review Committee and the SARC report. Where we vary is that we disagree on how we are to achieve those ends for the citizens of this province. It is clear that from this government in the announcement today we have some positive initiatives. However, we do question this government in terms of its approaches in certain key areas.

Yesterday we heard an announcement that this government is going to further entrench the universal nature of rent control in this province, and yet the Thom commission very clearly supported the recommendations that are also contained in the SARC report that the universal nature of rent control in this province harms and hurts the poor of this province more than anything else. So I am not surprised to learn today that the minister is reacting not with the solutions that her leader spoke of while he was on this side of the House but with the rather expensive Band-Aids that she now is able to extract from cabinet now that the NDP is the government.

The truth of the matter is that if we look in the last decade in this province—and I checked Hansard for 1982, when our province was experiencing similar financial difficulties with its economy—the government of the day, with support from all three political parties, chose to support the poor. The combined support in 1982 announced by the member for Scarborough Centre, the then minister Drea, was 17.7%, and today we have a 17% average increase. The fact is that we must ensure that this program is

implemented fairly and does not hurt certain groups in our society.

On that point, I wish to advise that on the issue of municipal taxes we have several communities now that have warned the government that they are in deficit positions because of growing increased welfare costs. Some municipalities, like my own in Halton region, are massively cutting programs in order to ensure that they have the moneys in order to pay perhaps the fastest-growing welfare rolls we have seen in a decade.

In fact, I hope that the Minister of the Environment will examine Hansard, because there are at least six major recycling programs that are being cancelled in Halton region as a direct result of finding the cash necessary in order to pay for the shortfall that is not included in the minister's announcement today.

I ask the minister, what will municipalities do in the second year? We know that there is a growing cynicism about the approach that governments take with first-year announcements, and then they let go of the hands of municipal taxpayers in the second year. Those total costs will be borne by what we know will be still rather large requirements for general welfare assistance.

PROTECTION OF IN-CARE RESIDENTS

Mr Jackson: If I may, very briefly, I would like to respond to the minister responsible for the vulnerable citizens in this province. Although I commend the appointment of a commissioner, I am concerned that the ministry officials who helped develop this report were very much aware of the circumstances which led to the need to make today's statement, and nowhere are we seeing a major policy statement with respect to advocacy and a commitment for regulating the very homes that these people find themselves in.

More important, as the Premier is in the House, I would ask the Premier to conduct yet another investigation of a report on advocacy for vulnerable adults. I wish to inform the Premier that I have acquired a copy of the David Weisstub report, which his Minister of Health withdrew from the public two months ago. I was able to acquire a copy, and the Ministry of Health has withdrawn it from public scrutiny. I would ask that in fact this government will release this report and let David Weisstub report to vulnerable adults in this province what their rights are in terms of being denied certain medical services.

ORAL QUESTIONS

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr Conway: My question is to the Minister of Energy and it concerns the energy policy of this government. Accepting, as I think we all do, the importance and value of energy conservation, of renewable energy and co-generation, can the minister confirm, however, that it is the energy policy of this government that there will be no new nuclear power facilities built in Ontario beyond those commitments already made at Darlington?

Hon Mrs Carter: I can confirm that there will be no new nuclear plants built in the immediate future. We have no plans to build any. We are pursuing, as the member

knows, a policy of conservation and energy efficiency. We have plans for other ways in which we can increase power supply if necessary. I would not, however, rule out absolutely the possibility of building new nuclear stations, although we do hope that will not be necessary.

Mr Conway: Mackenzie King would be truly proud of that response, which seems to be "Not necessarily nuclear but perhaps nuclear if necessary."

I want to ask the Minister of Energy, who made, I thought, quite a remarkable speech in the throne debate yesterday afternoon, what she would say to the thousands of men and women who work in Ontario in the nuclear industries, in communities like mine or in Peterborough or in Niagara Falls or in Cambridge, and what they are to make of her increasingly strident antinuclear position. What are we to say to those thousands of men and women whose jobs are at stake in this industry? What would she like those men and women to take from her comments today and, more especially, yesterday afternoon?

Hon Mrs Carter: There was nothing in my speech yesterday, I would like to point out, that in any way contradicted the speech from the throne. We have a lawyer's confirmation on this issue.

I would also like to point out that the life of a nuclear power station is 40 years. We are bringing new nuclear power stations on stream. All the Darlington power stations are being completed and will come on stream. There is no loss of jobs whatsoever as a result of our policies, no loss of jobs whatsoever for the foreseeable future, and our policies of conservation are going to create many extra jobs in this province. I reiterate: We are not destroying any jobs; we are creating jobs.

Mr McGuinty: Although I may be a lawyer, I can assure this House I am not a QC.

It is a logical inference from the statements that have been made in this House by the Premier and the Minister of Energy that their emphasis is on conservation. Essentially it is the people of this province who will be responsible for determining the need for nuclear power through their personal conservation efforts. The people of Ontario are looking for new programs and new directions. The minister has failed to bring forward any such new programs to save energy this winter. Can the minister inform this House today about the specific details of her energy conservation plan to be in effect this winter?

Hon Mrs Carter: I find this question rather strange. Nuclear power stations projected by the previous government and by Ontario Hydro would not have come on stream for another 12 years; so I fail to see what their relevance is to this winter.

It so happens that several power stations, including five nuclear power stations, have not been functioning recently. Some of the nuclear power stations have been less reliable than we had hoped. However, several of these stations are coming back on stream, having been repaired, at the beginning of December; more are coming back on stream in the new year. There is no likelihood of power outages this winter, none whatsoever.

1410

RENT REGULATION

Ms Poole: Yesterday, when I asked the Minister of Housing the status of uncompleted renovations due to his new legislation, he had not even considered a plan to deal with the problem. Let's talk about the plight of the tenants at 109 Jameson. The building is partway through a major renovation program, partially in response to city of Toronto work orders. The tenant advocates at Parkdale Community Legal Services have been involved to ensure that necessary work is done.

Yesterday, upon hearing the minister's announcement, the landlord ordered work crews off the job. What is the minister going to do to make sure that the tenants of 109 Jameson do not spend the next two years in suspended animation, waiting for the holes in their walls to be repaired and for the uncompleted construction to be finished?

Hon Mr Cooke: I very much appreciate the fact that the member has raised the plight of the tenants at 109 Jameson. I am sure the member understands that under the Liberal rent review legislation which the tenants of this province have had to survive through in the last few years, in the guideline that is set each year there is provision for maintenance and for some limited capital. The member understands the guideline as well as I do.

But does she also understand that the tenants of this building at 109 Jameson right now are facing a rent increase of 35% that would be effective 1 August 1989, which was applied for under the old rent legislation, and that another rent increase of an additional 50% was applied for by this landlord, which would have been effective 1 October of this year.

That is 85% in two years as a result of a building that was sold with financing costs to be passed through. It is a building that was bought by a landlord who knew there had been a lot of neglect. There are 31 outstanding work orders. I am surprised that a member like her, who has advocated for tenants for many years, would suggest that any rent review system in this province should reward a landlord like this.

Ms Poole: The minister does not seem to comprehend. I am not standing here in support of the landlord. I am standing here in support of the tenants. The reason that the Parkdale Community Legal Services has been involved is that a great deal of the work involved in that building was necessary. It was in a sad state of repair. The other thing the minister does not seem to comprehend is that, yes, tenants are very concerned about affordable rents, but they are equally as concerned about the maintenance of their buildings. It is their home. They want a decent and comfortable place in which to live.

Yesterday, when the minister made his announcement, he said that tenants will pay for increases in taxes, hydro rates and heating oil above and beyond the guideline. But when the boiler breaks down and there is no heat, who is going to pay for that new boiler so the tenants will not freeze? When the toilets overflow because the pipes have corroded, who is going to pay for that new plumbing?

When the electrical wiring becomes hazardous, who is going to pay for that new wiring? What advice does the Minister of Slums have for tenants?

Hon Mr Cooke: My advice to the member is that the philosophy she is enunciating here today is to institute a rent review system tenants would have had to live under that would reward landlords who deliberately neglect their buildings. That is exactly what she is suggesting by her approach. This building was clearly not properly taken care of. The current owner of the building bought the building in that state of repair. Because of the current rent review legislation, which says that when a new owner buys it he does not have to care about the ongoing neglect that occurred by a previous owner, now we are in this kind of circumstance.

It is our responsibility now to pick up the pieces that the Liberals have left this government, with a rent review system that is totally inadequate, and bring in a rent review system that offers real protection for tenants. We have accepted that challenge and we intend to deliver.

Ms Poole: It was a nice try by the Minister of Housing, but I was not talking about the tenants at 109 Jameson. I was talking about tenants all across this province who are relying on this government to show some leadership as to what is going to happen to major repairs and renovations.

The minister knows well that over 75% of the housing stock in this province was built prior to 1975. They are old buildings. Would the minister consider these things to be luxury renovations? No, they are not. They are necessary and they are not included in his announcement. Apartment buildings need new boilers now. Crumbling plaster needs to be replaced today. Apartment garages are corroding today. What is the minister's solution for tenants who need major repairs and renovations today, not two years from now?

Hon Mr Cooke: The solution is very clear. The rent review guidelines that the member's government developed include money for landlords to properly maintain their buildings. There are standards at the municipal level. There is the Residential Rental Standards Board at the provincial level. Those bodies will in fact continue to have the responsibility to enforce those standards. I hope we can look for the member's support for decent standards to be enforced and landlords to follow those standards. I hope we do not continue to get from her these types of questions which will reinforce landlords who have taken advantage of tenants and not met proper standards for tenants in the past.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Premier. I am sure he shares my view that voters are fed up with cynical election promises. I want to refer the Premier to his comments during the election, at which time he pledged categorically to lead a "national revolt against the GST." In fact, the Premier said he would rally the premiers of the other nine provinces to join him in this national revolt.

Since the Premier has been on the job for nearly three months, the only feeble effort we have seen to date is the Premier indicating that Ontario will join three other

provinces in an ill-fated legal challenge that is already in progress. Given that the goods and services tax will be in place within the next few weeks, can the Premier tell me when he plans to begin leading his national revolt?

Hon Mr Rae: I think that on balance the leader of the third party should reflect on the following facts. As opposed to his position—I am not clear what his position on the GST is—we have been very clear on our position. The first bill we introduced in this House, on the day of the throne speech, was to state categorically that Ontario would not put its tax on top of the GST. That was the first thing we did. I cannot imagine a clearer statement than that.

Because of the fact that the federal government was not listening in any other way, the Ontario government has joined with the governments of British Columbia and Alberta in two separate constitutional challenges, one with respect to the stuffing of the Senate with patronage Tory appointments, and the second having to do with the simple fact that we feel the imposition of the GST and the way in which it has been done are an invasion of an important area that has been occupied by the province for a significant time.

I can also tell the leader of the third party that next week the Treasurer is going to Winnipeg to meet with the other ministers of finance and to discuss the question of the GST with them. The simple fact of the matter is that where there has been an opportunity for Ontario to speak up and to act, not simply to talk but to take the steps that are within our powers, we have done so and we will continue to do so. That is the position of the government. I think it stands in rather marked contrast to the position of the Progressive Conservative Party in this House and in Canada as a whole.

1420

Mr Harris: I do not know how introducing a bill saying, "Well, it's a fait accompli, so here's what we'll do to tie into it," is leading a national revolt. I found the Premier's GST revolt pledge report in the Thunder Bay Times-News on Friday 17 August. In the same article, and I would suggest the Premier must have had a busy day that day, he promised that the NDP would empower the Ontario Energy Board to bring in a one-price system for gasoline. The Premier said, "I really think consumers are being ripped off by the gas companies."

I want to ask the Premier, since we have had no indication that he plans to keep his one price for gas promise, can we now assume that after his election the gas companies suddenly stopped ripping off consumers, as he alleged?

Hon Mr Rae: I can only tell the leader that I do not have a sudden announcement to make for him today. I can only tell him that the subject is one which is under continual review by the government. The Ministry of Energy is looking at this on an ongoing basis. I would also say to him that as and when I have an announcement to make, I will make it in this House.

Mr Harris: I am sure the Premier is beginning to understand why the public is so cynical about us all. Believe

it or not, the Premier also made another campaign promise on the very same day. One of those promises was that he would force Ontario Hydro to increase its uranium purchases from mines at Elliot Lake. At four, five, six or seven times the market price for uranium, this is what the Premier promised to do. Now, assuming that the Premier keeps this promise, and assuming he also keeps his throne speech promise to halt nuclear energy, what is the Premier going to do with all this expensive uranium he has promised to buy from Elliot Lake?

Hon Mr Rae: I may say to the leader of the third party that this is something that has been raised in this House on a number of occasions, including by the Minister of Natural Resources. Again, I do not have an announcement to make in that regard. I can only tell the leader that it obviously is a concern of this government that we have policies in place with respect to energy that make the most sense for the people of the province and that benefit the people of the province. That is what we are committed to doing but, as I say, I do not have an announcement to make today with respect to the question of uranium purchases in Elliot Lake.

Mr Harris: It was pretty clear in August that the Premier promised Elliot Lake he was going to buy more uranium from them.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr Harris: My second question is to the Premier as well. Would the Premier tell this House if it is the policy of his new government that only unionized companies can do business with the government?

Hon Mr Rae: To be very direct with the leader of the third party, I honestly do not know the answer to that question. It is not something which has been discussed in cabinet. It is not something which I have participated in any discussions about. If he has a zinger as his second question, I will wait for it, but it is not a subject I have discussed since taking office on 1 October.

Mr Harris: I thought it was a pretty straightforward question. Is it a policy or not? I guess the answer is that the Premier does not know what his own policy is in dealing with awarding contracts.

On 14 May 1990, an Ontario carpet company was awarded a contract to lay carpet at the Ontario Labour Relations Board offices. Would the Premier explain why, following the election of his NDP government, this contract, properly tendered and properly awarded, was summarily terminated solely on the basis that the company was not unionized?

Hon Mr Rae: Again, I honestly cannot give the leader an answer to the question as to whether what he says is a fair characterization of what has taken place or not. I do not know. But obviously now that he has raised it, I will look into it and I will report back to him as soon as I have an answer.

Mr Harris: In the interests of the two thirds or so of the workforce that is not unionized in this province and of the companies that have been able to bid on government contracts, I hope he does look into it very quickly.

As he is looking into it, I would like the Premier to know that the company had already measured the offices at the labour board; it had purchased the carpet and it had scheduled the work. In fact, the carpet is now sitting in a government warehouse, unused but totally paid for by the taxpayers.

Yesterday we discovered that the Ontario Public Service Employees Union is making decisions for his Ministry of Community and Social Services. Today we find out that organized labour is dictating who and what companies will do business with the province of Ontario. I ask the Premier to investigate as well who is calling the shots over there, he and his cabinet ministers or OPSEU and the big unions.

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the question. I can simply tell the leader of the third party that I, as Premier of the province and president of the executive council, consult widely with people and then we make decisions. I have promised the leader of the third party that I will investigate the particular incident he has raised. I would simply say to him with respect to his characterization of matters with regard to social services that I think his characterization is extraordinarily unfair and inaccurate, and I would simply leave it at that.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION FINANCING

Mr Daigeler: My question is to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Unfortunately, the throne speech said nothing or practically nothing about the government's plans for colleges and universities. I guess that is hardly surprising since the New Democratic Party's *An Agenda for People* was silent on this matter as well.

I also noticed that the minister last week at Mohawk College said that money is not available for post-secondary education: "The whole funding question is very much a wait-and-see attitude. We will be lucky this year if we can give the system anything more than inflation-level funding."

Finally, I found it rather significant that at the 8 November rally by the Ontario Federation of Students, the minister sent the parliamentary assistant for the Ministry of Skills Development, rather than attend himself or be represented by his parliamentary assistant for the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

I would like to ask the minister whether his absence at the OFS rally and the absence of higher education in the throne speech is an indication of his government's support for colleges and universities.

1430

Hon Mr Allen: I am delighted to answer the question because it concerns the funding and the attention that needs to be devoted to the long-neglected post-secondary system in this province, which I inherited at the level of ninth out of 10 provinces in terms of the operational grants funding per student when measured against the other provinces in Canada.

If the member wishes to know exactly what I was doing when that rally was taking place, I was visiting Lakehead University and Confederation College. I was especially interested in the quality of education of post-

secondary students in the north and the northwest, and I was especially interested to discover what was happening with respect to access for native students in both those institutions.

I will continue to underscore in my ministry an overriding concern for both access questions and the quality of education at the universities of this province as long as I am minister.

Mr Daigeler: I just would like to say to the minister that his absence, and certainly the absence of his own parliamentary assistant, was noticed by the students, who otherwise were mostly supportive of his side of the House.

In spite of the minister's assurances, on which we have seen no evidence so far, universities are taking their own steps at present to ensure the future of higher education in this province. You will have read last week in the newspapers that the University of Toronto business school is considering a proposal that would, in effect, privatize the MBA program and require students to pay the full cost of their studies.

Can the minister explain to the House what his government's position is with regard to such plans and specifically to the MBA program at the University of Toronto, and whether he has communicated his views to the university and how he is going to prevent them from proceeding with these plans?

Hon Mr Allen: With regard to the question that is specifically asked about the University of Toronto and the MBA program, that is an ongoing program that has been there since 1982, and only minor adjustments are being proposed with respect to it; so if the member has concerns now, I suppose he has had them for the last three or four years.

The decision is to be made this week at the university whether the readjustment of that program will continue. There is a very serious question at the heart of it, and that is how universities and colleges may provide what might be called contract services to private interests for training and professional services and professional education. That is the question or the issue that has to be addressed, which has been left again to this portfolio and which this case calls attention to. We are examining that question and will have some answer to it. But I have to tell the member that the specific proposal in question opens the way for further registration, in point of fact, for about 60 more students in the undergraduate program.

RENT REGULATION

Mr Tilson: I have a question for the Premier. I refer the Premier to the fall 1989 issue of the Tenants' Bulletin. In that publication there was an interview with Michael Melling, who was then chair of the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations. In that, the Premier stated in answer to a question about how to get private rental stock out of the hands of the large owners: "You make it less profitable for people to own it. I would bring in a very rigid, tough system of rent review. Simple. Eliminate the exceptions and loopholes. There will be a huge squawk from the speculative community and you say to them, 'If you are unhappy, we will buy you out.'"

Is that really the Premier's policy? Is that his hidden agenda? Is he really going to buy them out?

Hon Mr Rae: The policy that was announced by the minister yesterday is the policy of the government. The purpose of the policy is to provide fairness for tenants and to put an end to speculation. The purpose of the policy is to allow security of tenure for tenants and to recognize that their homes and apartments are as valuable to them as residences which are privately owned.

The member refers to a statement which he quotes from an earlier publication. I can only say to him it was the policy of the previous government, as well as, if I may say so, of other governments, that if it is possible to create policies over time which will perhaps allow tenants to be involved in the purchase of their own buildings on a non-profit basis, if we can convert residences which are owned on a non-profit basis, that strikes me as a good idea. That strikes me as something which would be good, to allow tenants to have that security and to make sure that buildings are no longer in the speculative stream, which is where they are right now.

Mr Tilson: In that same interview, the Premier is further quoted: "You can't talk about rent review till you talk about the structure of ownership, and that, to me, is what needs to change in the rental housing field." Is that still the Premier's policy? How do these sorts of comments square with his commitment of fairness? Does he not agree that the moratorium announced yesterday by the Minister of Housing discriminates against responsible landlords?

Hon Mr Rae: I really believe that the member had better get a handle, and I am sure he will over time, on what the experience of tenants has been over the last several years. We have had buildings flip after flip after flip after flip. We have had tenants pay and pay and pay and pay again. We now have the spectacle of landlords saying that rents that have gone up by 5% and 6% and 7% a year over the past several years are not going to be used for basic repair and maintenance of buildings. We have landlords saying, "Unless we get increases of 30% and 35% and 40%, then we're not going to bother to maintain the buildings."

Something has to be done to put this in perspective, and that is what we are determined to do: to ensure that tenants have security, that tenants have fairness, and to make sure there is in place a structure, a range of ownership across this province, which allows tenants to have security and which makes sure that people's apartments are taken as seriously as places to live as private residences. That is what we are all about.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Mr Duignan: Let me extend my congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on your election as Speaker.

My question today is to the Minister of Housing. Given the failure of the previous governments to honour the commitments to deal with the affordable housing crisis in this province—witness the fact that fewer than 6,000 units under the Homes Now program have been completed—can the minister ensure this House that the remaining 24,000 units will be completed?

Hon Mr Cooke: Right after the time that we were sworn in as the government, we started discussing in the ministry exactly how we could take advantage of the Homes Now program that was initiated by the previous government and make sure that the commitment of 30,000 units was a commitment that was delivered in this province.

I am pleased to inform the House that it is now the projection of our ministry that, through a process of reallocation—we have reallocated housing which people and groups could not deliver in time with the deadlines to other groups that can deliver—by the end of this year we will have 9,500 of the Homes Now units committed and ready to begin, and in 1991 we expect to be able to commit 20,500 units. We will put more social housing units on the market next year than ever in the history of this province.

Mr Duignan: On behalf of another 20,500 families that are going to receive affordable housing in this province, I thank the minister.

Can the minister indicate under what circumstances he has lifted the 31 March deadline in relation to the Homes Now program?

1440

Hon Mr Cooke: We decided that in order to facilitate the construction and the allocation of all 30,000 Homes Now units we would reverse a policy the former government had. We changed the 31 March arbitrary deadline the previous government had put in place and have allowed for circumstances by which there can be exceptions; they will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The bottom line is that if the sponsoring group can have the units committed and begun by the end of September 1991, then they will keep their allocation because we want that housing on the market next year.

OAK RIDGES MORaine

Mrs Caplan: My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to congratulate him on undertaking this very important and significant portfolio. I know the municipalities in this province are expecting, and I think rightly so, significant things from this new minister.

The Oak Ridges moraine is part of our natural resources and our heritage and is crucial to the clean drinking water supply of the residents of the greater Toronto area. A number of important reviews of the moraine have been undertaken, including the Kantor report as well as the Crombie report. The former Liberal government declared a provincial interest in this area under the Planning Act to protect the moraine from inappropriate land use. Can the minister today state his commitment to protecting the Oak Ridges moraine?

Hon Mr Cooke: I must say that after the experience of the past few years of asking the member many questions, there are many things with which I am tempted to begin the response to her question, but I will not.

We are trying to develop a well-planned system in this province—innovative and creative—that will deliver to the needs of the people of this province. However, on this particular issue I can indicate to the member that I have

spent a little time with my ministry staff reviewing the issue. Because of other pressures in the housing field, I have not been able to spend a lot of time. We are obviously interested in taking whatever steps are necessary to protect the area. There will be a more comprehensive response when the minister responsible for the greater Toronto area also responds to the Crombie report.

Mrs Caplan: I would ask the minister to be more specific. Will he or will he not today reaffirm the provincial interest in the Oak Ridges moraine that was declared by the previous Liberal government because of our commitment to ensuring that the greater Toronto area had a clean water supply for the future? Yes or no to the sustained provincial interest that was declared in July 1990.

Hon Mr Cooke: There is no change in policy at all. There is a provincial interest. That has been declared. We are certainly continuing that policy. In terms of other questions dealing both with the Crombie report and other policy questions we have to respond to, I cannot give the member anything more than that today.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Mrs Cunningham: My question is for the Minister of Education. She and I will know and I think many of our colleagues in this House will understand that all of us spoke at some time during the most recent election about the need for technological studies and technical education in our school systems. We want to be competitive in a global economy both in Ontario and in Canada. I am sure the minister is aware of the recent Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation report subtitled "Technical Education in Ontario High Schools is Facing a Crisis." It was released this September, and the same report was released last September. It is not new that I am standing here asking this question. The minister is aware of it. What are her plans to face this crisis of a teacher shortage in technological studies courses in our school systems for next September in Ontario?

Hon Mrs Boyd: It is quite true that the OSSTF released a similar report last year, which was found to be highly overstated in terms of the number of teachers that were available. In fact, the overestimate of shortages is by about 25%. It is quite clear that this is a projection again and not yet a fact; it is speculation.

There is no question that our letters of permission in terms of technological education have been reduced significantly this year, I believe from 173 letters of permission during the last school year to 57 during this year. We are very pleased that the program now ongoing, particularly the summer program at Queen's University, has done a great deal to improve the availability of technological teachers.

We have a problem with distribution; there is no question about that. It is difficult for us to attract teachers in the technology field into the high-cost Metro area and also into the isolated areas of the north. That is creating a distribution problem. It is our intention to encourage Queen's, and Queen's has indicated an interest in continuing the summer program next year. It is our belief that this will be of great assistance in handling any kind of shortage.

The other issue, of course, is the whole matter of the ongoing curriculum review in terms of technology and the teacher education issues that arise out of that. That is part of the ongoing restructuring that was begun under the previous government and to which we have committed ourselves.

Mrs Cunningham: I appreciate the minister's response. I think I can speak on behalf of many parents and students, certainly members of this House, to encourage her in her work.

The shortages that were relayed to the minister may have been overestimated, I do not know. But I do know one thing: They are not new. They began in the early 1980s. As a matter of fact, a report was commissioned in 1985 and released in 1988 which also supported the real concern about matching the needs for technological studies with the availability of teachers. It is also true that this is not good enough, just the technical education courses in the schools. We are also looking to get skills training out in the workplace in apprenticeship programs.

My question now would be, what is the minister doing with the Ministry of Skills Development other than the pilot programs we all know about? We know there are six or eight pilot programs. What is she doing with the Ministry of Skills Development to work towards getting more industry and business involved in the apprenticeship training program? Is that ministry actually helping the minister and assisting her and encouraging her in the very important work she has to do in providing training and skills for young people?

Hon Mrs Boyd: We certainly are working inter-ministerially; that is a commitment of our government. We recognize that in this area unless the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the Ministry of Skills Development work very closely together to ensure that there is articulation between the various levels of education and unless we work to make that a continuing process, we are not going to be able to deal with what we regard to be a crisis in terms of the growth of skilled trades and technological expertise in this province. This is a party that has long been concerned about the lack of emphasis in this area of education. We are certainly committed to improving the record of the last two governments in this regard.

POLICE SERVICES

Mr Wessinger: My question is addressed to the Solicitor General. As he is probably aware, eight municipalities in Simcoe county will be amalgamated on 1 January 1991. The three new towns will be the amalgamated town of Alliston, Beeton, Tecumseth and Tottenham; the amalgamated town of Bradford and West Gwillimbury; and the town of Innisfil, which includes the former village of Cookstown.

Can the minister tell me who will be responsible for policing this restructured area of south Simcoe county?

Hon Mr Farnan: The County of Simcoe Act defines policing responsibilities for each of the three towns. The municipal police force and the OPP will continue to police those areas they were responsible for prior to amalgama-

tion. However, each of those municipalities will have three options following 1 January 1991. To expand the municipal force, they will have to choose either to contract their service to another municipality or to contract to the OPP. What I should stress, however, is that after 1 January, if it is contracted to the OPP, then they will have to pay for that service.

1450

Mr Wessinger: Is it not true that the existing policy and protocol for contract OPP policing were designed to address the requests from small municipalities seeking an alternative to a municipal police force and do not address the sensitivity of all police staff affected by amalgamation? If so, when does the minister expect to be able to announce a new protocol, and will it be in place to meet the immediate needs of my community?

Hon Mr Farnan: Indeed, the protocol has been a concern. In order that we would develop a protocol that was effective, we met with the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police, the Ontario Provincial Police Association, the municipal police authorities, the Ontario Provincial Police authorities. Indeed, I am happy to inform the House that as a result of these fine consultations we have developed a protocol that will indeed fit the needs of the small municipalities as we face the future. We look forward to working with them and the new protocol.

POLICE LEGISLATION

Mr Curling: My question also is to the Solicitor General. In the minister's recent remarks at the Ontario Police College, he applauded the leadership shown by the Liberal government, and justifiably so. He was applauding it in the development of the passage of the Police Services Act. At that time he described the Police Services Act as leading edge legislation and indicated that he was preparing for full proclamation of the legislation by year-end.

My question is, will the minister reaffirm this commitment to proclaim the Police Services Act by year-end?

Hon Mr Farnan: I am happy to answer the question. I should talk just very briefly about the Police Services Act. The reality of the matter is that I believe we have made a lot of progress. However, I often think that as politicians we get carried away by our effectiveness.

In reality, many creative advances were made in policing. The old Police Act was not changed since 1940. In fact, the Police Services Act in many ways recognizes the advances that have been made in policing, advances that we can continue to work on through the regulations.

I am happy to inform the member in this House that we are working very diligently to proclaim the act by the end of this year.

Mr Curling: I am very pleased that the minister was so precise that we will have the proclamation by the end of the year. However, as the minister will be aware, prior to the proclamation of any legislation, it is normal that regulations to the act are drafted and passed by cabinet. The minister will also be aware that in the case of the Police Services Act, these regulations are crucial in the

management of the day-to-day activities of the police and how they interact with the public.

I am also sure that the minister will be aware that his leader, now the Premier of Ontario, and his caucus, which is now the government of Ontario, strongly argued that these important regulations be developed in an open, public way and that the regulations be reviewed by a committee of the Legislature prior to proclamation.

Will the minister commit to the development of these regulations in an open, public process advocated by his own leader, or will the minister make the important decision behind closed doors with no input by the public?

Hon Mr Farnan: How could the honourable member think otherwise? Let me assure the honourable member that indeed there will be extensive consultations with our partners in policing, that there will be extensive consultation not only with police services personnel but with the public that is affected by policing. Indeed, we intend to develop these regulations in a very particular manner and we intend to have the opportunity for input all across the board.

BUDGET

Mr Stockwell: My question is to the Treasurer. According to the Provincial Auditor's 1990 annual report, there are some suggestions that the previous Liberal government in fact knowingly manipulated the provincial government's books for two reasons—hard to believe—(a) to more closely mirror its 1990 projected budget and (b) to remove \$884 million of debt from the fiscal year 1990, thereby decreasing the deficit from \$3.4 billion to \$2.5 billion. The auditor said:

"There is a perception that the government is, in reality, managing and adjusting its actual results so they will more closely parallel its" operating results. "This in turn raises serious doubts concerning the integrity of the accounting process."

Does the Treasurer consider this to be an acceptable approach to fiscal risk management? When did he learn about this and how does he propose that financial gamesmanship such as this never happens again?

Hon Mr Laughren: I would like to welcome the member to this House and trust that he will find the adjustment from municipal politics to provincial politics without too much hardship.

It is a fair question, a legitimate question. It was no secret that what they call preflows were being done. That was a very open process, as I recall it. The Provincial Auditor does not like it when Treasury preflows from one fiscal year into another year. I might say, though, that there are people who do like it, such as the hospitals and the schools and the universities and the colleges, where they are able to get money sooner than they would otherwise have done so.

In his report this year the auditor has asked us to consider changing that policy, and there is no question that we are actively considering changing the policy. I do want to have a little more time, however, to think seriously about the long-run implications of just saying flatly, "No, there will be no more preflows from one fiscal year into the

next." I do not think it is a deceptive process when it is done very openly, that it is what you are doing in order to advance funds to a particular sector of our economy.

Mr Stockwell: The auditor suggests that it is manipulating the operating results and that it casts doubts about the integrity of the accounting process. Obviously this is very much a concern of the auditor. Clearly it is not something that he would approve, and I am asking the Treasurer today how he would ensure that if this in fact does happen again, it is sent back through the process to one of the standing committees so that we can do the job we are elected to do. It is very difficult as it is now to compare year to year; if there are preflows, it makes the job next to impossible.

Hon Mr Laughren: I want to assure the honourable member first of all that the possibility of preflowing any cash in the next couple of years is extremely remote, so it is not going to be an immediate problem for us, even the temptation of doing it. I want to assure the member that we are doing exactly what the Provincial Auditor is asking us to do in his report. He says he wishes us to consider the policy because he simply does not like the accounting aspects of it. I am not quarrelling with the Provincial Auditor in that regard.

All I am saying to the member is that I really do want to take a careful look at the long-run implications of simply saying, "No, we will never preflow any funds." It is quite conceivable, for example, that there could be an adjustment of funds coming from the federal government as a result of one of our tax-sharing agreements that would come in very late in the year that we might very well want to preflow. As a matter of fact, I believe that is exactly what happened last year when almost \$1 billion came unexpectedly from the—

Interjection.

Hon Mr Laughren: All right. Anyway, almost \$900 million came from the federal government to the provincial government late in the fiscal year and therefore a decision was made to preflow it into this fiscal year.

The member is quite right and the auditor, of course, is quite right that it does alter either the deficit or the surplus figure in the following fiscal year. So we are actively doing exactly what the auditor asked us to do: to consider the policy.

1500

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Hon Mr Rae: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I want to advise the House that I have just received some information relating to a question which was put to me by the leader of the third party with respect to carpet installation at 400 University Avenue. With the permission of the House, I wonder if I could answer the question, if that is okay, or would you like me to do it at the end of question period?

The Speaker: Do we have the unanimous consent of the House?

Agreed to.

The Speaker: In fairness, I will ask that the clock be stopped.

Hon Mr Rae: My advice is as follows: It has been the practice of the Ministry of Labour since 1983—which is, of course, when the Conservative Party was in power—to use unionized labour on contracts for leasehold improvements at 400 University Avenue.

On 21 August 1990, the Ministry of Labour requested the Ministry of Government Services to issue a contract for the purchase and installation of carpet on the sixth floor of 400 University Avenue. The contract was awarded through a competitive process to provide such goods and services at fixed unit prices.

Subsequent to the award of the contract but prior to the commencement of the installation work, the ministry was advised that the installers were non-union workers. Since it has been the practice of the Ministry of Labour since 1983, under a Conservative administration, and continued through from 1985 under a Liberal administration, for a union contract to be used for the installation of the carpet, the ministry requested that the installation be done by unionized installers. The project has been reactivated and is going to go forward using union labour in the Ministry of Labour building. The vendor will be compensated for any out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a result of the ministry's request. The carpet was purchased and fully paid for. It will be used and installed in the Ministry of Labour once union installers have been contracted.

If I may say to the member from North Bay, all of this was done without any intervention by any minister of this government, and as I understand it, or any intervention by any minister under the previous government. It was done as a matter of basic Ministry of Labour policy with regard to the installation and the use of union labour on the property at 400 University Avenue. That is the beginning and end of policy. Since it was established by the Conservatives in 1983, it seems to me that there are some Conservative traditions that are worth preserving, and that is one of them.

Mr Harris: Normally in the House when time was given for answer to a previously asked question, there was always a supplementary granted. I am assuming that is still a practice and would like to take that opportunity.

I would ask the Premier if he now knows the answer to the first question I asked, which he did not know when I asked it. That is, is it government policy that all companies doing business with this government have to be union? I was surprised the Premier did not know one way or the other.

Second, could he explain why the contractor, the successful bidder, who when he was contacted, when he offered to supply union installers, was told: "No, you can't do that. You've just lost it. We'll take the contract away from you"?

Hon Mr Rae: No, I cannot explain that. I will look into that on behalf of the leader of the third party. I am reluctant to sort of rattle on about things I am not fully aware of, but so far as I am aware, there has been no change.

Mr Sorbara: There's a change of policy. There's the first good news we've heard from this government.

Hon Mr Rae: That is a first change. That is a major change. That in itself is a change of policy. I think I am going to stick to my previous answer and say that as far as I am aware there has been no change with regard to the basic principles of competitive tendering. There should be no change, as far as I am personally concerned. There is no need to, except in an instance where the Ministry of Labour has felt that as a matter, as I say, of preserving certain Conservative traditions in the province, there was a need to continue with that one. I will look into the particular question with regard to the particular contractor. If the member will send me the name of the contractor, I will make inquiries with the Ministry of Labour to find out how it happened in that way.

ASSISTED HOUSING

Mr Mammoliti: My question is to the Minister of Housing. On 1 February 1990 the Ministry of Housing—more specifically, the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority—adopted a new policy. That policy is called the secondary wage earner policy. In a nutshell, the policy forces secondary wage earners to pay rent as well as the leaseholder. This poses an obvious disadvantage. There is no incentive for them to leave the MTHA complex and to save money and perhaps to buy a home of their own. Is the minister aware of the problem? Is he concerned about it?

Hon Mr Cooke: I certainly appreciate the question. I think all members of the Legislature who have had tenants from the Ontario Housing Corp call them have heard of the concern of how rents are calculated for dependent children or children who are still living at home with their parents in the OHC.

I can indicate to the member that, yes, I am aware that the policy was changed in September by the Ontario Housing Corp. I am also aware that there are concerns being expressed that the reforms simply do not recognize the situation of parents who cannot collect rent from their children who are still at home. We intend, along with the Ontario Housing Corp to review the policy and see if the policy can be reformed further to reflect needs of families in OHC units across the province.

Mr Mammoliti: I am concerned about it, seeing that the concentration of the MTHA is just under 20% in my riding. Would the minister be prepared to let me know whether he is prepared to do something in the immediate future, and if so, when?

Hon Mr Cooke: Yes, I will let the member know as soon as we have a policy decision. I would certainly invite him and all members of the Legislature who have opinions on this important issue to contact my office. I would be glad to discuss it further.

CONDUCT OF CABINET MINISTERS

Mr Mahoney: Can the Premier tell this House under what standards his cabinet and caucus are operating? Does he have guidelines for the conduct of his cabinet and caucus colleagues, and will he table them in this House?

Hon Mr Rae: I am currently drafting and working on those guidelines. They will be publicly available very shortly. They will be discussed with the leaders of the opposition parties.

In addition to that, I have already discussed with leaders of the opposition parties the fact that I think it will be a good idea for a committee of the House to look at the broader question of conflict-of-interest laws in the province. I am going to be presenting the House and cabinet and the public with guidelines with respect to the conduct of cabinet ministers. I am going to be doing that shortly. I expect to be able to do it before Christmas.

The Speaker: Time for oral questions has expired. Members may recall that we even stopped the clock for a while to handle a question and an answer which normally would have run. I am sure the intense interest will bring you back to the building on Monday.

1510

PETITIONS

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr Eves: I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Request that the province of Ontario declare December 6 as Women's Remembrance Day. We request 14 seconds of silence be observed in schools, workplaces, institutions and media to commemorate the 14 women massacred at École Polytechnique in Montreal on the same date in 1989, and all women victims of violence in Canada."

This petition is signed by some 60 concerned constituents and I am affixing my signature thereto.

WATER AND SEWAGE UTILITY

Mr Wiseman: I have a petition here signed by 3,719 residents in Ajax, and they petition this House, the Legislature of Ontario, as follows:

"Through your resources and agencies, to prevail upon the regional municipality of Durham to reverse its decision to significantly expand the water supply plant located on the Ajax waterfront and locate it in a more suitable industrial zone. We are all citizens of Ajax who are committed to the preservation of waterfront park lands for the enjoyment and use of present and future generations. The proposed project is one we fear may well, if sanctioned, be the beginning of yet a further desecration of the wonderful community asset, truly the jewel in Ajax's crown. We urgently appeal to you to prevent this desecration."

I also have affixed my signature to this petition.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

RESTOULE SNOWMOBILE CLUB ACT, 1990

Mr Eves moved first reading of Bill Pr9, An Act to revive Restoule Snowmobile Club.

Motion agreed to.

LA CAPANNA HOMES (NON-PROFIT) INC ACT, 1990

Mr Ferguson moved first reading of Bill Pr48, An Act to revive La Capanna Homes (Non-Profit) Inc.

Motion agreed to.

ALARM SYSTEMS ACT, 1990

Mr McLean moved first reading of Bill 5, An Act to regulate Alarm Systems.

Motion agreed to.

HERITAGE DAY ACT, 1990

Mr McLean moved first reading of Bill 6, An Act respecting Heritage Day.

Motion agreed to.

GODERICH-EXETER RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED ACT, 1990

Mr Klopp moved first reading of Bill Pr22, An Act respecting Goderich-Exeter Railway Company Limited.

Motion agreed to.

LORDINA LIMITED ACT, 1990

Mr Eves moved first reading of Bill Pr45, An Act to revive Lordina Limited.

Motion agreed to.

POWERS OF ATTORNEY AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Sterling moved first reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend the Powers of Attorney Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Sterling: This bill basically gives the right to a person to give to another person the right to make decisions on his or her behalf, should he or she become incapacitated. This bill would specifically give the person the right to transfer to another person the right to withdraw medical services or medical treatment, should the person who has been the donor of the power become incapacitated.

NATURAL DEATH ACT, 1990

Mr Sterling moved first reading of Bill 8, An Act respecting Natural Death.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Sterling: This embodies the concept of a living will in legislation. As opposed to the previous bill which I introduced, this bill gives a general direction to the world or to a doctor as to what a donor might like done, should he or she be placed in a position of not being able to speak for himself or herself. Therefore, what it embodies is a kind of structure that a person would draft a document whereby he or she would describe certain circumstances under which he or she would want the withdrawal of medical treatment or medical services so he or she could die a natural death.

1520

ORDERS OF THE DAY

OPPOSITION DAY
GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr Harris moved opposition day motion 1:

This House, noting the increase in the number of jobs lost through layoffs, the rising unemployment rate, the increase in the social assistance case load and in the cost of social assistance programs and noting the deterioration in the province's financial position, urges the government to abandon the tax and spend approach to financial management which has dominated the province's fiscal policy for the past five years, an approach which has added to inflationary pressures and reduced the competitiveness of Ontario's industries, and to adopt a policy of restraint to control costs and to provide the opportunity for tax relief.

Mr Harris: I introduced this motion because I felt it was essential to impress upon the government our view that it simply cannot continue to follow the doctrine of tax and spend which has served as the foundation of fiscal policy in this province for the past five years.

I thought it was important to do this for three reasons: first, because of my personal conviction that the fiscal policy of the government of Ontario over the past five years is in part responsible for the current severe economic downturn; second, because I am concerned that the new NDP government is poised to repeat and compound the errors of its predecessor; and third, because I am convinced the control of government expenditure, the element of policy too long ignored by governments in this province, is vital to the achievement of long-term fiscal stability, moderate tax rates and a development of an aggressive, productive and competitive economy that is capable of generating new wealth and therefore creating jobs.

I appreciate that there are members who will reject my contention that Ontario fiscal policy is in part responsible for this recession. I am aware, for example, that the current interim leader of the official opposition sent a spirited letter to Ottawa just a few months ago, disputing this claim to Ottawa.

I would say parenthetically that I suspect my honourable friend has fewer reasons to communicate with the federal government in his new capacity. However, I fully expect some members to pass the buck, to engage in some enthusiastic finger pointing in the direction of the federal government, to spend more time and energy trying to fix the blame than trying to fix the problem. Some members can always be counted on to play the old political game.

I would remind those members that the results of the last election clearly show that the public is thoroughly fed up with the old political game, with the old politics as usual, and if we are to be brutally frank, with politicians as usual.

Playing the old political game has eroded confidence in government and public institutions, with public opinion

surveys showing that almost half of Canadians believe that none of the political parties really stands for the things that they believe in. Further, according to the numbers I read in *The Big Picture*, a recent survey of trends in Canadian opinion, playing the old political game has also reduced public trust in politicians.

Today nearly 60% of the population think we are unprincipled, 81% think we are more concerned with making money than with helping people, 65% think we are incompetent, while apparently only 32% can think of anything good to say about us all, regardless of party.

If members want to reinforce these perceptions, if they want to convince the public that this place is occupied by hacks driven only by the search for partisan advantage, then I say play on.

I would also reassure members that the claim that Ontario fiscal policy played a role in causing this recession and in limiting the competitiveness of our economy is not a product of some Tory fantasy.

I would call members' attention, for instance, to the 1990 pre-budget submission of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce wherein the chamber stated, "The Ontario government, through its actions and activities, has been a major part of the inflationary pressures that have led to the current economic slowdown."

I would also remind the members of the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto's submission to the former Treasurer, who is in the room, in which the board warned that Ontario "major league taxes" were hampering and jeopardizing our industrial competitiveness.

As well, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association reported just last month that we have slipped from second to fifth among industrialized nations in terms of our manufacturing productivity and that, if the current trends continue, the competitiveness gap between us and our major competitors in the G-6 group will continue to widen. In Ontario, in the past year, some 77,000 manufacturing jobs have been swallowed up in that competitiveness gap.

The members could also examine the findings of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business' recent report, entitled *Taxing Ourselves to Death: The Small Business Tax Burden in Canada*. The CFIB analysis found that among the four most industrialized Canadian provinces, that is to say among Ontario, Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia, "Ontario has no equal when it comes to imposing taxes on businesses in all three size categories." The CFIB also concluded that, "Ontario's heavy tax burden unquestionably contributes to the highest provincial business bankruptcy rate in Canada."

As for the province's payroll tax policy, no less an authority than the government's own Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology warned that the imposition of a payroll tax would make it more difficult for the small business sector to create and maintain jobs. I find it ironic, and I am saddened as well, that since the implementation of that tax last 1 January, it also corresponds almost to the day with when we began to seriously lose most of those 79,000 manufacturing jobs.

So, these experts—not me, not my party, but these independent experts—tell us that Ontario's fiscal policy has

been inflationary, that it has undermined competitiveness, that it has increased bankruptcies and that it has discouraged job creation in this province.

The effect on the province's financial position has been equally negative, as anyone who has reviewed the Treasurer's statements and the quarterly financial reports can attest. The purported surplus in this year's budget, largely manufactured to begin with, as we argued last spring and as the Provincial Auditor confirmed only recently, has evaporated. In its place we have a \$2.5-billion—and growing daily—deficit.

This year, as in the past five years, the government will again overshoot its budget plan expenditure target, a record which begs the question of why the government bothers to develop a budget plan in the first place.

In short, the fiscal policy of the past five years has made us the most heavily taxed jurisdiction in North America, increased our public debt, raised the expenditure base to a level which cannot be sustained in the absence of an economic boom without either another round of tax increases or another runup in the debt.

Regrettably, antigrowth and countercompetitive policies have not been limited to the fiscal policy field. As Professor Richard Lipsey, director of the economic growth and policy program at the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, noted in his address to the Vancouver Institute, the province of Ontario has been following a discredited policy path similar to that taken in Europe in the 1960s, a policy path out of touch with the realities of a highly competitive and globalized market.

1530

We have pursued policies which result in stories like the one I read the other day in the *Globe and Mail* about an Ontario high-tech company—in this case Stetron International Inc of Markham—which is trying to decide if it can afford to stay in Ontario or if it has to move to Buffalo, New York, to stay competitive. The article noted that Stetron was not the only company pondering its future in the province and that, "With the rapid deterioration in Ontario's international competitiveness during the late 1980s, to stay or to go is a decision that more and more businesses in Canada's industrial heartland are facing."

Governments both here and in Ottawa must accept a large measure of responsibility for taxing away the competitive advantage of our industrial base. I wish I could say that all of that is behind us now and that the voters have turfed out the scoundrels before they could do even more damage to our economy. Personally, I find little comfort in what would normally be a very encouraging development, because as I mentioned at the outset, I am very concerned that the current NDP government is going to lumber down that same discredited policy path which the Liberals followed, to their eventual defeat.

I say that because I have seen nothing in the government's election platform, I have seen nothing in its throne speech and I have heard nothing in this House to show that the government is prepared to make the tough decisions necessary to achieve fiscal stability, long-term prosperity and jobs for Ontarians.

What I have seen are some disconcerting headlines such as this one from the *Toronto Sun*, 20 November, announcing: "NDP Could Double Deficit." The good news is—get this—that our current Treasurer would not allow a \$10-billion deficit. I do not know if this means that the Treasurer could comfortably live with a \$9.5-billion deficit or not, because I believe I have heard that his comfort zone is somewhere in the \$5-billion neighbourhood. But I fear that our colleague the member for Nickel Belt is in danger of becoming the Carl Sagan of fiscal policy, since he seems to only relate to numbers in the billions and billions of dollars.

In any event, we shall see the results in a year or two because I suspect, and I am very comfortable going on record today to say it, that the Treasurer is well on his way in the next year and a half or two to a \$10-billion deficit.

Another gem, this one from a CBC press release on a profile of the Treasurer on the people's network's Monitor program: The release dated 19 November was headlined, "Ontario Treasurer Says He'll Raise Taxes," and pointed out that the Treasurer, while acknowledging that his party did not run a campaign of raising taxes, strongly disagrees with people who suggest that the NDP does not in fact have a mandate to raise taxes.

Our current Treasurer seems to have come down with what I like to call the Liberal disease, which causes those who suffer from it to equate a majority government with a blank cheque signed by the taxpayers.

I would remind the Treasurer that the members of the last majority government in Ontario, which did not run on a campaign of raising taxes and then proceeded to raise them some 32 times, are currently warming the benches only recently vacated by the Treasurer and his colleagues. There may be a lesson in that for the Treasurer and for the Premier.

Another headline, another sign of things to come: "Ontario Considers New Gas Tax." Of course, like the Liberal government they helped put in office, our resident greenies are not considering hiking the tax merely to fatten the Treasurer's coffers. They will tell us that a gasoline tax hike or the introduction of a new carbon tax will be good for the environment, that if we really want to hug a tree, we will have to mug a taxpayer. We have heard all this before, but I thought the special status of green taxes like the tire tax had gone up in smoke along with those 13 million tires at Hagersville.

One final headline, this one from the *Financial Post* of 19 September: It reads: "Rae to Spend Way Out of Recession." I am forced to conclude that the NDP government is determined to be as shortsighted as its Liberal predecessor; that is, reserve the right to play tweedledumber to the Liberal's tweedledumb. Since the Liberals taxed and spent our way into a recession, the new kids on the block will try to fix it by taxing and spending our way out of it.

However, the one thing I have never heard from the current Treasurer during his brief tenure, nor from the honourable interim leader of the official opposition when he held that portfolio, is any serious discussion of the need to control expenditures, of the need to more effectively and

efficiently manage government spending and the need to cut out the substantial fat and waste in government.

Government seems to be wearing blinkers on this issue. It seems to me that the words "save" and "restraint" have vanished from the government's vocabulary. But surely after massive tax hikes imposed during a period of sustained economic expansion have failed to eliminate the deficit and balance our budget, and after achieving the highest level of expenditure growth of any Canadian jurisdiction without achieving a commensurate increase in the level and quality of public services, the time has come to take a long hard look at our expenditures, to acknowledge that some questions about the way we spend money surely are in order.

The time has come to acknowledge, as an expert witness before the standing committee on finance and economic affairs of this House told the committee, that: "To ensure continued prosperity, Ontario policymakers must adopt a more prudent spending agenda and refrain from tax increases. A co-ordinated streamlining of existing programs is needed to make room for new requirements. Attempts to pay for new programs and to offset a softer revenue trend with more tax increases will be self-defeating. Such action will simply encourage the relocation of activity and jobs beyond provincial borders."

I hope that the Treasurer is listening because the bottom line is that a continuation of tax-and-spend policies will lead to the piecemeal dismantling of the Ontario industrial base. It will lead to a steady erosion in our standard of living. It will perpetuate a public policy environment inimical to the growth of what the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has called the aggressive economy. According to the CMA, sound public policy is one of the four pillars on which an aggressive and competitive economy is built. The public policy environment which encourages competitiveness has a number of features, but the two most relevant for our purposes are that it is a policy designed to control spending and to limit the tax burden. It is, in short, a policy designed to do precisely what we have not been doing and to achieve objectives which do not appear to be of even marginal interest to the current administration.

During the recent months and over this next period of time, it is obvious that government must reduce its demands on our economy. The prosperity of our society, the range of opportunities available to our children, the quality of public services do not depend either solely or primarily on the compassion of government, but do depend on the competitiveness of our economy and the ability of our economy to support them.

I invite all members who care about securing the opportunity for growth and all members willing to do more than simply pay lipservice to this goal of achieving a future for this province as prosperous as its past to join in support of this resolution.

1540

Hon Mr Laughren: I am pleased to rise in my place and defend my honour in this debate. I appreciated the member for Nipissing, the leader of the third party, putting

this motion in Orders and Notices. I think it is appropriate to have this debate at this time, early in this session. It is also, I think, a good signal for the official opposition as to the intent of the third party on economic matters in the next several years. It is certainly a good shot across the bow from the leader of the third party.

However, I found the member's remarks somewhat pessimistic about the Ontario economy. I do not share that pessimism. I found, quite frankly, that when I was in opposition with the leader of the third party he was more fairminded and evenhanded than he is now, but perhaps that is a natural course of events.

I must say that some of the words in the motion that is in Orders and Notices are indeed appropriate. We are indeed in a recession, as I said before, and we are indeed going to be facing a deficit of \$2.5 billion this year. We are still determined to live within that deficit. I must say, though, that we part company most profoundly on the way in which we should deal with the recession. For the member for Nipissing to try to convince us that the way out of the recession is to cut back even more, to cut taxes and cut back on expenditures—

Mr Nixon: Didn't it work for Herbert Hoover?

Hon Mr Laughren: It did not work for Herbert Hoover, it did not work for Ronald Reagan and it did not work for Margaret Thatcher. What the member for Nipissing is laying before the House, and I appreciate the stark way in which he has done it, is simply supply-side economics. You might find other words to describe it, but that is basically what this motion is; it is a commitment to supply-side economics. I feel most profoundly that is not the answer to a recession.

We saw what happened in the United States. It was Ronald Reagan's firm belief that if you cut taxes and cut government expenditures you would encourage people to spend and invest, and therefore the problems would be resolved in that manner. We know that has not happened. There is a record indebtedness in the United States now as a result of those policies. There have been all sorts of bad things that happened as a result of supply-side economics in the United States. We know, for example, that there is more homelessness in the United States now than there has ever been. We know that the education standards are declining in the United States and I would attribute a lot of that to supply-side economics. We know that they do not have a health care system in the United States along the lines that we have here.

There are all sorts of things that happened in the United States. Deregulation is a part of supply-side economics, in my view. We saw the disaster that brought to the savings and loan corporations in the United States, for example. It also leads to things like the proliferation of junk bonds. They have totally gutted the health and safety regulations in the United States. I could go on and on and on about supply-side economics.

We on this side feel very strongly that the approach we have taken is the right approach to getting ourselves out of this recession. It is admitted, of course, that we will have a deficit, but I can tell members that this deficit is not caused

by anything that we have done so far. We know—the numbers are all there for all members to see—that as we headed into this recession the retail sales tax dropped dramatically, corporation income taxes dropped dramatically, and welfare case loads shot up dramatically—and the member is right, they are growing daily. We know that is a serious problem.

At the same time, for the member for Nipissing to say that the answer is to cut back even more seems to me strange indeed. That is not the answer to getting ourselves out of this recession. That is why we made a very deliberate decision to do something to stimulate the economy to get ourselves out of it, at the same time making a long-term investment in the public infrastructure in this province. I do not mean this as a particularly partisan shot, but a lot of that public infrastructure has been allowed to run down by the preceding two governments.

By implementing our \$700-million antirecession package on short-term capital works we are going to improve the capital infrastructure and the public infrastructure in this province. It is long overdue. I am glad we have this opportunity to do it. I regret that it is because of a recession that we are doing it. At the same time, it is an opportunity to put some much-needed capital into our public infrastructure.

When the local levels of government become involved in that antirecession package, we are talking about a \$1-billion incentive into the economy within the next year. We think that is a major attempt and a very positive way to try to combat the recession. To simply batten down the hatches, as someone said, Herbert Hoover style, I think would really be counterproductive at this time.

We have every intention of managing the economy in this province in a prudent way. We know that we have to examine existing programs if we are going to introduce new programs. It is not simply a case of for ever adding programs on top of other programs. Certainly, management of existing programs is part of any kind of sensible management of an economy. We, of course, have already indicated to the various ministries that we expect that to happen as we head into the budgetary process for the 1991-92 year. I know that the present leader of the official opposition had built into the budgetary process for this year some constraints on programs in the various ministries to start with. So we know that is ongoing.

I just am a little taken aback by the leader of the third party blaming us and blaming government spending for a recession. That I do not understand. Also, putting the blame for inflation on us is ridiculous. Ontario, as we sit here this afternoon, has the lowest inflation rate in Canada, and that is what makes no sense about what the federal government is doing to us too. The federal government has said that in the province of Ontario we are causing inflationary pressures. At the same time they are bringing in a goods and services tax, or at least they want to, on 1 January that is going to add a minimum of 1.3 points to the consumer price index. We think it will be even more than 1.3; we think it will be about 1.5 points on the inflation rate.

So for the federal government, and through them to the member for Nipissing, to say that Ontario is adding inflationary pressures, I think is just fundamentally wrong and they should be pointing—

Mr Sterling: When the spending has gone up by 150% in the past five years?

Hon Mr Laughren: For the members opposite to say that Ontario is responsible for inflation is wrong. Ontario has the lowest inflation rate in the country.

Mr Carr: The western premiers said it too.

Mr Sterling: Speak to the western premiers.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Laughren: I do not expect them to agree with me. I would ask, however, that they put the deficit figure in some kind of perspective. The deficit for this fiscal year, \$2.5 billion—we still believe we can stay within that number—is less than 1% of the gross domestic product of the province, 0.9%. If you go back to the deficits, the last time this province had a recession, back in 1981-82, the deficit as a percentage of the gross domestic product was higher than the deficit of \$2.5 billion this fiscal year. I have not just picked out one measurement. If you measure that deficit as a proportion of the total government expenditures, it is also less than it was back in 1982.

1550

I confess that the recession was deeper in 1981-82 and that it rebounded much more dramatically than we think it is going to rebound next year. At the same time, I think that the leader of the third party should be somewhat more fairminded when he talks about the deficit being \$2.5 billion and being concerned about that. Better that we recognize that we are indeed in a recession—a recession, I might add, that the Conference Board of Canada, which is not exactly an NDP front, even claims is a made-in-Canada recession and clearly points the finger at the monetary policy of the federal government. It is plain and simple.

If members want to look at where we are being hurt the most in the province of Ontario it is in manufacturing and construction, and high interest rates and the high value of the Canadian dollar are hurting us a great deal. I hope that the leader of the third party will take the time to sit down with his federal counterparts in Ottawa and tell them that we are hurting in Ontario. Ontario is feeling the brunt of this recession more than any other province. We would all be well served if the leader of the third party would talk to his friends in Ottawa and convince them of the wrongheadedness of their monetary policies; They are simply not working. It is time that interest rates were lowered so we can get on with reinvesting not just in the Ontario economy but all across this land.

I do not want to take a lot of time this afternoon. I simply want to express my appreciation to the member of the third party for putting the motion in Orders and Notices. I think it is appropriate that we have a debate. I am very pleased that my parliamentary assistant, the member for Hamilton Centre, is going to play a major role in

the debate this afternoon. His advice is the kind I usually take; he is being of great assistance to me.

Mr Eves: Boy, this must be a new Floyd.

Hon Mr Laughren: It is absolutely true. I am looking forward to his role in this debate this afternoon.

I would conclude by simply saying that while we are in a recession, while we are heading for deficits, the Ontario economy is basically sound. It is going to take us a year before we start coming out of the recession, but we are surely going to do that. There are some unknowns we have to cope with, such as the US economy, such as the Gulf crisis and the price of oil, but we are a healthy, basically sound economy, and we are going to come out of this recession. We have been through worse recessions than this before, and I trust we will manage the economy in a way that all members will applaud at the end of the day.

Mr Nixon: Mr Speaker, may I first offer my congratulations to you, sir, on your elevation to the position of the Deputy Speakership. We have enjoyed your supervision in the past. We know you are a most intelligent and moderate person, and we look forward to serving under your direction in the future as well.

Mr Christopherson: Is he running for the leadership?

Mr Nixon: Well, maybe he will, but this is a good job he has.

I also am glad to take part in this debate, because I think it is a useful thing to do. I can recall five years ago, as the new government took office, that the circumstances were substantially different; we inherited a deficit which we inflated as much as we possibly could. It came in at just over \$3 billion; that was in a budget of about \$23 billion. The honourable Treasurer, having done his magic on a balanced budget, has come up with \$2.5 billion in a \$44-billion budget. We are prepared to live with that, as we have no choice other than falling on our swords again. Once is enough.

Five years ago the economy was growing rapidly. I was not nervy enough at the time to take credit for that, because the economy all over the world was expanding. Many people said it was Ronald Reagan's tax cuts that did it. Many people indicated it was Margaret Thatcher's iconoclastic leadership; the icons in that instance were the labour unions and they were clasted. The whole world was going forward.

Over those five years dramatic changes occurred, and we in Ontario benefited from them enormously. We had a rate of growth higher than any of the other economies in the western world. We had a very high rate of increase and expenditure, as the leader of the third party has indicated in his comments. I suppose our justification at the time was that we were filling in for the inadequate commitments to infrastructure from the previous government, exactly the same arguments we are hearing now in this House. In fact, the requirements of the community were growing very rapidly and there were not very many people in this House, even in the Conservative Party, who were voting against more money for schools and hospitals, roads and environmental programs, development of the north and job opportunities for our young people.

As a matter of fact, as Treasurer I used to note very dramatically that the Progressive Conservatives in those days would decry additional expenditure in almost the same breath they would call for more services. They are not much more rational now, but they are elected and they are here, so what are we going to do about it?

I would say that during the five years, the deficit, even though the Provincial Auditor and the honourable member for Scarborough West feel it was somehow manipulated, even though it was done by the Progressive Conservatives in 1974-75 just before an election, and done, I believe, in 1979-80 by the saint of the Tory Party, Frank Miller, that great Treasurer, with the support of the present leader of the third party, who for a few brief moments was fluttering in the limelight of being a cabinet minister—just before his wings caught fire and he dived into northern Ontario only just recently to be heard of again. During these five years, the efforts of the Liberal government created 560,000 new jobs. The honourable leader of the third party feels that most of those were created in the civil service; he thought we were hiring all our friends. Actually, we made a mistake and hired mostly NDPs; there is more truth to that than fiction. In fact, the growing economy was creating jobs at a great rate. I do not take credit for that any more than I blame the present recession on the NDP, but I think people should know that since the NDP took office, the net job loss in the province has been 160 jobs every day, seven days a week. What a record. Even the Minister of Labour is turning red; his hair is turning grey. We will get around to their abject failures in correcting this loss some time in the future.

I want to say also that when we talk about civil servants, at the same time as the number of civil servants was growing, our population was growing, our service was growing. If the members look at the statistics put out by Statistics Canada—totally independent, although there is a federal Tory government—the actual number of residents per civil servant is the lowest in this jurisdiction of all the provincial jurisdictions and, of course, far lower than the government of Canada.

I think those statistics are interesting to compare and should be borne in mind when the troglodytes of the far right start saying that we are hiring too many people and that somehow the civil servants should be working harder and working better and that sort of thing. They can have that policy all to themselves. We are not going to squeeze in on that, because we believe the civil servants are working hard, that there are demands out there, and that the province is served effectively and efficiently. We will be looking for efficiencies in government, which is our duty just as it is for not only the members of the PC party but for all members of the Legislature.

It is interesting to note that while we are castigated for having tax rates that are too high, the important tax rates are low, lower than most other jurisdictions. For example, at present we have the lowest effective personal income tax rate in Canada for middle-income families with children. Those are the people who pay a lot of tax.

As a matter of fact, during my brief time as Treasurer, our policies actually removed over 600,000 low-income

people from the tax rolls. These are people who pay income tax at the federal level but do not pay here. I wish we could have done more. One of the things I firmly expect in the first NDP budget, if the government lasts that long—I was predicting it would not last until Christmas; we shall see—is that one of the major additional expenditures will be to increase the number of people at the low end of the income spectrum who will be removed from the personal income tax rolls entirely. I certainly will not criticize the Treasurer if he does that. I wish we could have done more, but we removed more than half a million people from paying personal income tax which, I guess, at least in politics, is a step in the right direction.

1600

Mr Harris: You removed half of them by throwing them out of work.

Mr Nixon: No, sir. The average income went up faster here during our years than at any time in history, and we created jobs at a faster rate in this province than at any time in history. Just in case the honourable leader of the third party, who was out washing his hands briefly, forgot all the statistics I presented to him, I want to tell him again that during our years we created jobs at a rate of 300 new jobs every day for five years. No one can take that number away, because it is correct. Even the leader of the third party has simply got to accept it.

In the environment, we raised the expenditures, the commitments, by 128% over five years. We brought in the blue box program, which did more to reduce the waste stream than anything else. I am a great fan of the present Minister of the Environment, as I was of her predecessor. I supported him as I support her, as do all members, in their efforts to reduce the waste stream. It will be interesting to see how successful the current minister's efforts are compared to the former minister's. Their commitments are the same. I would say that blue box program, which was recognized internationally by the United Nations, is an outstanding one and one we should all be proud of.

I am not apologizing, for example, even for the tire tax the honourable member mentioned. It is bringing in \$40 million to \$45 million a year. That money, while it goes into the consolidated revenue fund, obviously is used to support environmental programs. I sincerely wish that there had not been a tire fire, but there was. I hope the present Minister of the Environment, as she finds her feet and gets an opportunity to bring her attention to this important matter, will get support from her colleagues, as she certainly will from here, in bringing forward the proper approach to cleaning up the mess of old tires. We are getting 11 million new old tires, if you want to put it that way, every year, and "something must be done." I did my little bit by whacking on a tax of \$45 million. That money should be considered an environmental tax; we did, and I believe the new government will and must as well.

I want to say something about the health budget. I am only going to take about five minutes more, I say to those people who are getting ready to speak. We increased it from about \$8.7 billion to \$15.3 billion, and it has gone up beyond that. The elimination of OHIP premiums is

probably the accomplishment I was associated directly with in which I have the greatest pride. People do not like to pay the new health care tax. That is too bad, but we have a lot of money to pay in this connection. Most people recognize that it is a fairer and more appropriate way to fund medicare, at least in part. Please remember that this tax pays only about 14% to 15% of the medicare costs.

Hospital funding, particularly capital funding, rose dramatically during these years. Our spending on home care tripled. I would suggest that the new Treasurer and all of us in the House will be asked to support an even faster escalation of the costs of a totally new approach to home care, which was the policy of the past government, which was certainly provided with excellent leadership in the public service and I believe will go forward without any equivocation and I hope without any delay.

It is interesting also in health that the hospitals are lobbying so dramatically the Minister of Health, who seems to bow under every pressure; members may have noticed that themselves, having worked with her themselves in the New Democratic government. Hospitals are coming forward in this strong and effective way, demanding more money. Naturally, as Treasurer and still as interim Leader of the Opposition, I support their requirements as strongly as I possibly can, I really do, but I think it should be borne in mind that last year the increase in the commitments to the hospitals was just under 10%, one of the largest; I believe it was about 9.7%.

There is some thought that no appropriate money was made available for pay equity and for the payment of the new health tax. Of course, there is no money made available specifically to pay nurses or to buy iodine or whatever it is they use, or anything else. They are given an amount of \$6.6 billion with which, under the direction of their own boards, they provide the services that are required under the hospital act and under the direction of the Minister of Health. So it is an extremely important issue that must involve all of us in this House.

In education there were substantial advances. We provided enough money so that school boards can pay our teachers at a rate that is generally accepted to be among the highest in North America and in the world. They are the only group I know of in the teaching community with a fully indexed pension at 70% of the average of their best five years. Naturally, this is totally unsatisfactory. Just like members of this House, who also have an inadequate pay scale and an inadequate pension, there is a minor degree of dissatisfaction. Perhaps, even though these pay scales and this pension that has been determined are still inadequate, we will see what the Treasurer does with that as he moves forward in meeting the problems he faces.

I simply want to say in closing that rather than the province of Ontario interfering with the nation's economy—and the policy I put forward as Treasurer was supported by my colleagues in the government and in the Legislature—we felt that taxes should increase sufficiently to pay the costs of our programs. The costs of the programs did go up during our years from about \$23 billion to about \$45 billion; in fact, a bit more, now that the

Treasurer has moved next year's payments into this year's. We could debate that some time.

I think at the same time you need only look at the record, not only for the improvement of our services but for the fact that we paid the bills. For the last fiscal year we not only paid the bills, and that is 100% of capital, but for the first time since 1948 we actually reduced the provincial debt.

It is strange that the leader of the third party should criticize that. I see he has gone out to wash his hands again, but I think it is important that being a fairminded person himself and a Progressive Conservative, he should be aware that it is the Progressive Conservative debt in Ottawa which is rapidly leading us towards a \$500-billion national debt and that it is the high taxes of the Progressive Conservative government in Ottawa, the new goods and services tax that is being imposed on us by the Progressive Conservative government, that is really ruining the economy of Ontario and the nation.

It seems the leader of the third party is somehow hanging by his heels from the chandelier, because he has everything wrong, he has everything upside down. On that basis, there is no way that the thoughtful, moderate, Liberal Party would ever think of voting for this particular motion.

Mr Stockwell: We got everything wrong, apparently, but I am pleased to have this opportunity to participate in this debate on the first opposition day before the House in this 35th Parliament.

I believe the motion is very timely, as the economy is under considerable stress and the province's financial position is deteriorating, and I believe the government of the day is determined to pour gasoline on this fire.

None of this was supposed to happen. Let's remember back a year or so ago when we were debating the previous budget. The last budget projected that it would have a slower real economic growth of 1.7%, an unemployment rate of 5.6%—and remember when they had a surplus of \$30 million? We all remember those heady days, do we not? Well, given our experience to date, I think the Treasury department should get its water tested, because clearly something is in the water that is making these people live on Fantasy Island. None of those things happened, none of them came about.

What was so interesting about that debate was that in Ontario I recall the former Premier boasting during the general election campaign that Ontario was virtually inflation-proof, that back-to-back balanced budgets left the province with enormous flexibility to cope with the high interest rates, a high dollar and a sharp decline in the economic growth. We are inflation-proof; there will be no recession in Ontario, according to the previous government.

1610

Something went very, very wrong, and given the shape our economy is in today and given the shape of the provincial government books, we know the only enormous flexibility that existed was in the then Premier's perception of the facts and the former government's accounting

methods. I know that hindsight is 20/20, but what the heck was the man talking about when he said that Ontario was virtually recession-proof? I do not know and I am not sure they know. They will not take credit for this recession, yet they are prepared to take credit for all the jobs, all the new moneys and all the programs. They cannot have their cake and eat it too. So here we are today suggesting to this Liberal government that stood in here for five years that it spent and spent and spent and that today we are feeling the economic wrath of that spending.

The deficit was not paid down. The deficit was increased over five years. Those are the figures that you do not get. Our unemployment rate, adjusted, is running at 6.7%, up 2.2% from the rate a year ago. The youth unemployment rate is alarming. It is up 3.8% to 11.8%. The forecast modest growth has not materialized and the latest forecast from the Conference Board of Canada projects that our real gross domestic product will actually decline by nearly a full point. Those are dangerous numbers. It will be the second quarter of 1991 before we will experience any real growth in our economy.

Over the first 10 months of this year, some 2,278 businesses have gone bankrupt, in Ontario a 63% increase in levels experienced in 1989. The number of layoffs is currently running ahead of the rate experienced in the 1981-82 recession, and by the end of the year the number of layoffs could be as much as 71% higher than 1982, the last recessionary decline in this province.

The cost of welfare and social assistance programs has ballooned, along with the growth in unemployment rates and the increase in the number of layoffs. Last month the family benefits assistance case load stood at 219,773, an increase of more than 26,000 compared with October 1989. As of September of this year, there were an additional 96,780 people receiving benefits through the general welfare assistance program. We do not need any more statistics to prove what we know: we are in a slowdown and a recession. The slowdown in the economy has exposed the fragile nature of the province's finances, as the projected \$30-million surplus has proved to be the product of wishful thinking and fun with numbers.

The \$2.5-billion deficit we face in this province today stands as an indictment of the shortsighted policies of the government, which frittered away the boom dividend and which used taxation to avoid making tough decisions on spending. And make no mistake about it: those were boom days, those were boom years. The Treasury's coffers were full and the spending continued. New taxes were introduced, and year after year we lost total control of how money left this building. We lost total control of the number of civil servants who were hired. We lost total control of the decision-making that led to this mess we are in today.

Clearly, if a prudent government were elected, it would know full well that during the good times, during the times when you have a boom economy, you put money away. You put it away because when the bad times roll around, you need it. The bad times are here and there is no money in the vaults. The size of the deficit must have been a bit of a surprise to the new Treasurer, who must feel somewhat

cheated. Certainly I do have some degree of sympathy for them, because I feel the Grits did the partying and the NDP ends up with the hangover.

The leader of my party has already detailed how provincial fiscal policy contributed to the recession, and rather than review the abysmal record of the former government, I want to take a few minutes to speculate about what we can expect from the present administration. Unfortunately, for a number of reasons, I expect that we are going to see more of the same.

First, the NDP and the Liberals are both soft socialist parties, and they have adopted a very similar approach to government. It is very difficult today to tell the difference between the present NDP government and the old Liberal government. For example, both like to say one thing on the campaign trail and another in office. We have already seen major reversals on Varsity Corp and Consumers' Gas.

For instance, on Varsity Corp the Premier told the *Financial Post* on 7 July, "We believe Varsity has to live up to its obligations and contracts it has signed, and we intend to do what is necessary to enforce them." The Premier later decided that doing what was necessary to enforce these contracts was a crap shoot and he negotiated a getaway package with yet another Ontario corporate refugee. Some things change, particularly when they get elected.

When the former government suggested last summer it was prepared to negotiate some sort of settlement with Varsity, the NDP opposition flew off the handle. The current Minister of Housing almost had a heart attack when the government of the day intimated that compensating displaced workers would make up for breaking promises to keep them employed. Frankly, when the Premier made what the *Financial Post* described as "his remarkable policy reversal on Varsity," I expected the government would have to hold its cabinet meetings in an oxygen tent, because I thought this about-face would have left them breathless with outrage. But I was wrong. They applauded the decision. The only thing that left them breathless was the energy they expended on self-congratulations.

Not long after Varsity flew the coop, the Premier changed his mind on the British Gas purchase of Consumers' Gas. Consumers' Gas was a company which the Premier thought should be a public utility and publicly owned. They have held that position for light years. I can only suggest that at every level of NDP government, be it federal, provincial or municipal, they have always expounded on the fact that we have to get more government intervention into the major corporations. A perfect opportunity, and the Premier thought so. But he changed his mind. He told them, "I think it would fit very nicely into the British Gas empire." He changed his mind after being elected.

The *Toronto Star*, that famous Liberal-NDP accord, editorialized on 9 November that the message to Ontarians implicit to the Consumers' Gas decision was that they were sadly mistaken if they thought the government would live by its word. It did not take but a week.

We have seen one policy on rent control in *An Agenda for People*, only to find the minister here yesterday back-

pedalling from citing the realities of the marketplace, the same realities he did his best to ignore in his announcement yesterday. Obviously, it is time for the minister to get real. We are witnessing a public backstroke on this particular issue, and the people are at risk, the financial institutions are at risk and the landlords are at risk.

At least one minister should develop a consistent definition of reality so that the landlords in Ontario will know which reality the minister is responding to—the reality of the marketplace or the reality that there are more tenant votes than landlord votes.

1620

Not to be outdone, the Minister of the Environment, whose mental gymnastics on waste management issues could earn her the title of the Olga Korbut of policymaking, announced on 21 November that she was suspending the Environmental Assessment Act exemptions on the proposed Whitevale and Brampton sites, suspending both those environmental assessments.

A day later, on 22 November, the minister was back saying that in case of an extreme emergency—an extreme emergency that we all know will happen—it would be possible to use the two greenfield sites, 6P and P1, without a full environmental assessment hearing.

If there is one party that I can give a few months of honeymoon to, if there are any parties that this can be given to—it could be given to a whole bunch of them, it could be given to all kinds of them, because a lot of them need time to find their feet and understand the issues—but if there is one party I have great difficulty in giving any honeymoon period to, it is the NDP, because it has consistently told us over the past number of years that it had instant answers to financial concerns, it had instant answers to the concerns of the people of Ontario and when it got into power it would implement them. As we see here today, they are not doing that. They have no honeymoon. What happened to their answers? Two months ago they knew everything. They have forgotten everything they learned. It is astounding.

In making a pronouncement, the minister ignored two important things. The first was the extreme emergency that would likely result from her own totally unrealistic waste management strategy. The waste management strategy consisted of—we are still not sure. The waste management strategy still is not before this House.

Metropolitan Toronto council has to deal with the waste management strategy today. The strategies that were passed at Metropolitan Toronto council were adopted. They have a strategy, but the provincial government has not got a strategy.

Hon Mr Philip: Where's your answer?

Mr Stockwell: The provincial government member yells across the floor, what is our strategy? My goodness, has he not learned yet? They won the election. When are they going to do something?

The second was, three months ago the minister's leader stood on the Maple site and made a solid commitment there would be no environmental assessment extension. It is clear that the Environment minister is having the same

trouble with reality as her colleague in Housing. Perhaps we should have her fitted with lead shoes so that she could walk around on Earth for a while.

None of these kinds of decisions, none of these proposals have any sense of reality; the same with their fiscal and financial approach to government. At least, in this tenor and style we have already seen a number of disturbing parallels between the former and current governments. The former government compiled a depressing list of broken promises and commitments, ranging from school funding to auto insurance, and this current crop seems determined to break that record. I suspect that these parallels will also extend into more substantive matters, such as fiscal policy.

In point of fact, the campaign platform of the current government was very much like the fiscal policy of the former government in that it followed the doctrine of tax and spend with a vengeance. On the tax side, this government promised a new corporate minimum tax to soak an additional \$1 billion a year out of the economy, a spec tax for a housing market that is not only dead but in the advanced stages of rigor mortis and a succession tax which assumes that all rich people in Ontario got that way from being stupid.

On the spending side, they are committed to increasing the provincial share of education costs to 60% over five years, though we have yet to learn how they will do this. But accumulative costs suggest it is going to be \$7.6 billion. Where do they plan to raise this money? Where do they plan to find this kind of money? They suggest it will be through their Fair Tax Commission that is not reporting back for, in their determination, at least 18 months. Yet, they have five years' worth of promises out there at \$7.6 billion. Their addition does not work. When are they going to start dealing with the realities of the situation and understand they cannot approve these election promises? They were not worth the paper they were printed on. They can throw them in the garbage, go to the landfill site and see how well their recycling program is doing by counting the number that come back.

They have promised to establish a public auto insurance system but have yet to say how much it will cost—another typical approach by this government. Here is the approach of this government: "Let us decide to do something, implement it and then get some cost-benefit analysis." Is that not an interesting way to do business? Obviously, businesses do not do it that way because they would be out of business. This government has interesting concepts.

We note that the Osborne Report of Inquiry into Motor Vehicle Accident Compensation in Ontario regarding public auto insurance suggested the cost would just be absolutely enormous. Those are not factored into the election promises. There is no concept of the cost that these promises will have on the taxpayers in the province. They are just promises.

As I stand here today, the members know full well that this government will not meet its 60% guidelines on education financing. They will not do it. They know it and we know it. Now they have to break the news to the school

boards. They do not have \$7.6 billion and they will not have it in the next five years, unless, of course, their Fair Tax Commission comes back with a machine that prints money.

We estimate that over a five-year period their day care commitments would cost at least \$720 million and that a five-year tab for their non-profit housing promises could run to \$1.7 billion. They made these promises. Their leader stood in this province in various locations, and as these promises came into his head, they came out of his mouth. That is as much thought and process as they gave these. They will never, ever approve this kind of expenditure unless they are going to tax this province to death. Maybe they will do that.

The taxpayers had better hope that much of An Agenda for People is never, ever implemented, because they will end up paying a very heavy price. What is really frightening is that the NDP in opposition thought the economic and fiscal policies of the former Liberal government were—get this—too conservative. It is mind-boggling.

They thought the Liberals' ideas of spending were too conservative: a government which hiked tax revenues—and we never hear this from the leader of the official opposition, we never hear these kind of numbers—by more than 130%; which increased its spending faster than any other government in this country, which increased the debt—he is saying he is paying down the debt—by 30% during one of the strongest and most sustained periods of economic growth in this province in 50 years.

He oversaw the expansion of the public service, and to be called conservative by anybody is unbelievable. If that record is an indication of what the NDP considers a conservative policy, then who knows what its liberal policies will look like?

Long-term economic and fiscal health requires more emphasis on spending controls and efforts to control the size of government. Be forewarned to this government. Government never created a single job. Every time it hires a new employee, it is simply another form of tax. That is the kind of spending we have to look for, line-by-line reviews of spending. Interdepartmental budgets have to be looked through. Those are the kind of expenditure cuts that they have to look at.

If we are going to address the issues that most of the people of this province want us to address, I found that the number one concern they had when I was campaigning was taxes. Taxes were the big issue, and a line-by-line review of how we get out of people's lives.

I own a small business. I know the recession is here. Just two weeks ago I had to lay off four people in my business. Is that not a shame? Four people who are out of work, four people who do not have a job to go to this week and four people who cannot feed their families because they are going to have to go out to look for a new job. Why? Because of taxes—taxes on top of taxes on top of taxes; spending on top of spending on top of spending.

The government should wake up, deal with the issue, get out of the people's lives, get off the backs of business and realize that the best thing they can do is stop spending money.

1630

Mr Christopherson: I think that it is important that the third party recognize that its simplistic ideas on taxation were dealt with rather thoroughly in the last provincial election, especially since it was the only issue it seemed to deal with in the last election. The people had an opportunity to listen to what that party had to say about this simplistic idea that its taxation ideas will solve everything and they rejected it out of hand.

I would also remind the Leader of the Opposition that his party was re-elected with its majority government after its accord with us. When they ran on their own record, when it was their own record that mattered, look who has the majority government.

I found the speech by the leader of the third party to be very curious, curious indeed. One of the things he talked about was that the words "save" and "restraint" have vanished from our vocabulary, yet it was very curious that the third party supported the announcement today of the increases in spending on social services. In fact, they bragged that they did something similar back at the beginning of the recession they faced in the early 1980s.

They cannot have it both ways. They cannot talk to us about playing politics on issues. That kind of spending has to be made right now because, if it is not, an awful lot of people in this province are going to be hurt and hurt even more than they otherwise would be, because of a made-in-Canada recession led by the same party that has the same simplistic ideas about taxation that the third party does.

The leader of the third party also talked about and made reference to polls and studies that are saying people are tired and fed up with politicians who play old political games. I say there is nothing older in terms of old political games than the kinds of consultation, supposed consultation, that took place in the past, both with the previous government and the government before it.

The reality is that nobody in this province honestly believed that they were being listened to. It was a rubber stamp. It was just a process to go out there. Most people believed the decision had already been made, and that was one of the key things that brought the previous government down. It was that they were not really listening.

The third party and the official opposition are spending a fair bit of time trying to ridicule us because we are talking a lot about consultation. I find it interesting that following our throne speech, which articulated our commitment to consultation, to reaching out and talking to people, in the *Hamilton Spectator* on 21 November—and I say clearly that this is in response to the throne speech—Lawrence Rotenberg, chairman of the economic policy committee of the Hamilton and District Chamber of Commerce, said, "We welcome the consultative approach the government is taking and look forward to working with them." He further said, "If ever there is a time to use a consultative approach, it is during a recession." It is worth pointing out that he is a tax lawyer. I want to be fair to this gentleman. I do not suggest for a minute that he is endorsing everything in the throne speech but, with regard to the consultative process, there is a lot of support right across the province because they know we are serious about it.

One of the key things we are going to consult on is the whole question of fair taxes in this province. When I was going door to door in the election and people raised the issue by saying, "Look, you've got promises out there. The current government has promises out there. How are you going to pay for them?" I did not tell them there would be no tax increases. I did not say, "You can count on us to never, ever raise a tax." What I did was I acknowledged that one of the things we would do is to revamp the tax system in this province so that it was fair, that it was based on people's ability to pay, that it did not continually hit the people who can least afford to pay.

I believe they bought that because they know that to meet the needs in this province for education, health care, social services, infrastructure, these things are going to cost dollars and, if there are any increases, they only ask that we at least be as fair as possible. Our Fair Tax Commission is all about that. The consultative process that we have committed to is going to ensure that everybody gets heard, not just those who want to receive the money. We will give an opportunity for tax experts like the person in my community and anyone else across this province who wants to have some input. The decision will not be made ahead of time. We will be listening to what people have to say and from that we will determine what is fair in this province.

I also found it curious to hear the leader of the third party suggest that there would be a lot of enthusiastic finger pointing on our part, that we would be spending more time trying to blame somebody for the situation we are in rather than dealing with it. I reject that totally out of hand. In fact, this government has been particularly careful, I believe, to ensure that we are not just throwing our arms in the air and saying, "It's all the fault of the past government; therefore, we're not going to do anything and it's all your fault." What we have said is that by the same token, when we are dealing with the issues in front of us, members should not try to negate the situation we are in.

We are not spending all our time pointing fingers like a certain federal government we know that spent more than a year saying the cupboards are bare and blaming the government before it. In fact, I just heard it's leader on television yesterday; we is still blaming the Liberal government for some of his woes. We have not taken that approach; we will never take that approach.

Rather we have said that we are going to take action to combat the recession we find ourselves in. One of the key things we have said we are going to do is to spend the \$700 million that the Treasurer has said will be committed to improving the infrastructure of this province. With cost-sharing, that will reach close to \$1 billion. That is solid action. That is not running from responsibility; that is not pointing a finger and blaming someone; that is taking some action.

The next thing we were faced with was the GST. There was a commitment on the part of the previous government that it was going to put its tax on top of that Tory tax. I do not recall exactly what the Tory position provincially was on a tax on a tax but, since Tories seem to love the GST,

and they are the only ones, I suspect they would have done the same thing.

What happened when the NDP formed a majority government and people said, "Aha, what are you going to do about the half a billion dollars it is going to cost you to keep your promise on not taxing a tax?" One of the first pieces of legislation that landed in this place was a bill to ensure this that tax on a tax did not take place. We met that promise. We did not even blink. It is there right now.

1640

Let's not forget the other actions that have been taking place almost every day since then. The announcements of the wage protection fund—again strong counterrecessionary actions—the announcements made on the transportation improvements, the announcements made on the social service improvements today—all of these things are meant to attack the recession, to ensure that we can respond when the recovery begins and that we make this affect real people as little as possible, as little as we can, given the situation that we do have.

Let me also state that we have got to bear in mind that while a lot of economists are saying the middle of next year, 1991, is about the time we can expect the economy to turn around, we also have to be aware there are a number of things on the horizon that could change things very dramatically. If war breaks out in the Middle East, aside from the human issue and the human cost, the effect to us economically speaking could be horrendous; also if the overvalued dollar continues, if the high interest rate continues. We do not know what effect any kind of trilateral trade agreement with Mexico might have. Everybody seems to be trying to fast-track it. That is something else that is a wild card. If the American economy continues to weaken, that could affect us also.

It is quite possible that the situation we now see could get worse. We do not believe it will. We are staying optimistic about our economy. But again, to quote Mr Romanko in the same article talking about the approach we are taking, he says, "The government seems to be taking a responsive and responsible approach."

In light of everything that is in front of us, in light of the possibilities that we must realistically look at, I would suggest that the main thing that is happening right now in both opposition parties is that they are worried. I have heard them say what they are worried about. They are worried about an NDP government that has said: "We've got four to five years to govern and when we're done, this is going to be a better province to live in. The quality of life will be better, and then you are going to have to face us in a re-election."

My last comment is that the only real shame in all of this is that Ontarians did not have the opportunity to benefit from an NDP government in good times. We intend to see that they get that chance.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms Haslam): I find it necessary to remind the House that we are here for speaking and listening.

Hon Mr Pouliot: We are being provoked here, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: I am afraid I do not agree. May I remind you in the remaining time to think on these things.

Mr Kwinter: I am delighted to participate in this debate. There is a phrase that we used to use quite regularly both in the 1985 Legislature and in the 1987 Legislature—I do not know who coined it first, but the phrase was "passing strange." Every once in a while—

Mr Villeneuve: Sam Cureatz.

Mr Kwinter: Sam Cureatz. Truly, I find it passing strange that we have a resolution before this House in the name of the leader of the third party that really condemns the present government, and by implication the previous government, on the economic situation facing us in Ontario.

The reason I find it passing strange is that if there is one thing that most businessmen and many economists are virtually unanimous on it is that notwithstanding that we go through cycles—and those members who are students of economics will know that the economy goes up, then dips a bit, then goes back up again; it is quite regular—we truly have a made-in-Canada recession that is a direct result of the federal government's policy on interest rates, which in turn has driven up the value of the dollar.

I would like to offer some advice to the government which is gratuitous. They can take it or they can leave it. But I would also like to set the stage for where I think we are, one of the reasons we got there and how we have to address it. We have just come through seven years of unprecedented economic growth. Just to put it into context for those members who may not have been observing it as intently as I did in my previous responsibilities as the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the Minister of Financial Institutions and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology—all economic portfolios—members should know that for the last seven years we have really had the most vibrant economy in the industrialized world. That is quite a statement to make, absolutely phenomenal. We have all benefited from that particular activity. All members have to do is look around and see what is happening.

Economists had been predicting for at least the last three years that there was going to be a recession. Every year, whether it be 1987, 1988 or 1989, some economist would stand up and say, "This is the year that we're going to have a recession because it is inevitable." Every year the economy would keep growing, and again in the jargon of the media we were into an extremely heated, and in Metropolitan Toronto an overheated, economy.

Economists will tell you that 4% unemployment is full employment. There are always people who are either changing jobs, looking for jobs or saying they are out of work but do not really want a job; so 4% is full employment. In Metro we had 3.5% unemployment. All you had to do was walk into any shopping centre, any retail store, and there would be a sign in the window, "Help Wanted: Full-time, Part-time." People were desperate. I had

businessmen coming to me on a regular basis saying: "The greatest crisis I have to face is the fact that I can't get skilled labour. I am trying. Our labour pool has dried up and it is unfortunate."

Again, many members here in this House are children or grandchildren of people who left their homeland because they perceived that opportunities were better in Canada. They came with their skills, with their trades, to set up a new life here and contribute to what is one of the finest jurisdictions in the world.

That has changed, and the reason it has changed of course is that the economies of some of these other places are now growing faster than ours is. They are saying: "Why should I dislocate my family? Why should I leave the United Kingdom? Why should I leave Germany? Why should I leave Italy? Our economies are booming. There are ample opportunities. We can make a life for ourselves where our roots are, where our families are, and we can thrive." That was not the case, so what we have is a very acute shortage of these skilled people who came to our shores and we benefited.

1650

In that kind of context, and we are now into a globalization of economies—as Marshall McLuhan said, we are into a global village—we now have a situation where the federal government negotiated a free trade agreement. I do not want in any way to rehash that particular debate, but it is important to know that when that debate was joined, a perception was put out by the federal government, by the federal cousins of our friends in the third party, that if we could only negotiate this agreement, we would have an economy that would be bountiful, that would grow. Peace would reign throughout the land and there would be two cars in every garage and three chickens in every pot.

What they did not say and what they would not admit was that at the time the agreement was negotiated, 80% of all the trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States was duty-free. There was a perception—I do not want to impute motive but there was a perception—that once we negotiated this agreement, this 250-million-person market was going to open up to us and we were going to have all of these benefits, when in fact 80% of it was already open to us. So what they have done is they have negotiated to have the 20% that is still dutiable reduced over a period of 10 years.

I think it is important that the members know that at the time the average tariff that was in place was between 7% and 10%. That was what we were talking about. We were talking about getting access for those products that had not been duty-free, to reduce that 7% to 10% average. I admit that some of the tariffs were as low as a 0.5% and some were as high as 50%, but on average it was between 7% and 10%. At the time the dollar was at 72 cents, which in fact was a non-tariff barrier because when you have one dollar that is 72 cents versus one dollar that is 100 cents, you have pretty good leverage.

What has happened since that agreement was negotiated is that the dollar has gone to 85 cents. That, of course, has taken that benefit away from our Canadian

exporters, to the degree where it has gone from 72 cent to 85. Why is that important? I think it is important that the members know that for every dollar you have in your pocket as an Ontarian, 35 cents is there because of trade. If you compare that to our American neighbours, 10 cents of every dollar they have in their pocket is there because of trade. So, in fact, we are three and a half times more dependent on trade than our American neighbours.

We are one of the most trade-dependent jurisdictions in the world, and that is what gives us our economy and gives us our vitality. If we did not have that trade, if, God forbid, we should drop to the 10%—we are a country of 27 million people stretched over a 3,000-mile border; effectively Canada is a country 100 miles deep and 3,000 miles wide—we would have severe economic difficulties.

Trade is absolutely essential, particularly when you consider that 80% of our trade is with the United States. In Ontario it is closer to 90%, but Canada-wide it is about 80%.

What has happened? We have a situation where the federal government has decided that the number one enemy of our economy is inflation. Inflation without doubt is a serious problem in any economy, but what they have decided to do is to raise interest rates artificially to dampen inflation. It sounds great and it is a sort of classic economic policy, but what has happened is that what they have not taken into consideration, in my opinion, is that they negotiated us into a free trade agreement which by its very nature—I still say it is not a free trade agreement; it is a bilateral trade agreement—implies that there would be a level playing field. At the present time, there is approximately a 5% spread in the cost of capital in the United States versus the cost of capital in Canada. That, of course, is interest, which means that an exporter in the United States exporting into Canada on a tariff-free basis, without doing anything, has got a 5% edge on his competitor. That is the number one problem.

Number two is that interest rates are artificially high. It means that people who have money to invest look at Canada and look at the United States. They are not investing it in capital assets. They are investing it in financial instruments to get the benefit of that high interest rate. That has put pressure on the dollar and has forced it up artificially. So you have what I call a double whammy. You have high interest rates and you have a high dollar, which means that the companies we have in Canada, and particularly in Ontario, can no longer compete. That is the major problem facing this province.

With all due respect to all of my colleagues in this House, what we do, whatever way, is tinkering around the edges. The problem with that tinkering is that every proposal that comes forward to cabinet by a very gung-ho minister, particularly a new minister who wants to make his or her mark, says: "This is a great policy. It's terrific. It's going to get us great headlines. We're going to do all of these wonderful things." What they are really doing is doing it in isolation. Each one in itself is excellent. When you compound all of those things, all of them together create problems where we become uncompetitive.

What we are faced with right now in Ontario is a situation where companies are looking at Ontario and saying: "It's a great place. It's got a great quality of life." But we have to compare that with a jurisdiction in the Sunbelt, where they have no energy costs to speak of for heating. We have to compare it with other jurisdictions in other parts of both Canada and the United States, where the minimum wage is lower. We have to compare it in all of the aspects that, individually, make eminent sense, but collectively put us in a position where the decisions that have to be made—the tragedy for this province and this country—many of those decisions are being made outside Ontario. All they are looking at is the bottom line. They look at it and say, "It doesn't pay us to go there."

What we have to do is make sure that we provide the citizens of this province with the best quality of life we can, but we have to be mindful that we also have to have the economic activity. We have to have the ability to create wealth, and not necessarily jobs. I want to make sure that there is no misunderstanding. Wealth creates the jobs, whereas if you are just creating the jobs, you are just putting a Band-Aid on it. You have to make sure there is wealth generated in this province. We have to do it with research and development. Before I close, I want to spend just a minute on that because I think it is absolutely critical.

We are now into a global economy, as I said earlier. We have non-traditional competitors; they have become very traditional in the last little while. I happen to be old enough to remember that if you gave somebody a product made in Japan, it was perceived to be synonymous with cheap and shoddy goods. I am old enough to remember that. You would almost be embarrassed to give somebody something that said, "Made in Japan."

Hon Mr Philip: If you are that old, how come you have such a young looking body? Tell us that.

Mr Kwinter: I thought the member was going to say, "How come you've got such a young-looking wife?" Give me a break. Make some points so when I go home, I am going to have some kind of positive thing.

1700

Anyway, the point I am trying to make is that we have countries like Japan which have come from a world reputation of producing cheap and shoddy goods to a world reputation of producing the finest goods in a whole array of disciplines. Again, the Germans used to have total domination of the camera market; it has gone over to the Japanese. Who would have thought that the number-one-selling car in the United States would be the Honda Accord? Who would have thought that of the 10 top banks in the world, most are Japanese? Who would have thought that the largest securities dealer in the world, Nomura, is Japanese?

I am saying to the members that this is a very strong example of how the world balance in economics has changed, but there are other players out there as well. There is Singapore and there is Hong Kong and there is Thailand and Taiwan, and the emerging Europe of 1992.

We have to make sure that what we do is not being done in isolation. Particularly with the GATT round that is coming to some sort of conclusion—we do not know what is going to happen in the next couple of weeks in Belgium—but certainly we have to make sure that the decisions we make are made with an eye on what is happening around us, because we are going to be impacted by it.

We are going to have to compete, which means we are going to have to make sure our resources are directed to an area where we can compete. We are going to have to be mindful of the fact that contrary to the way it was in 1981-82, a lot of the plants that are closing are not going to open up again, because the economic situation dictates that if you cannot compete then you are going to have to get out of the game.

We have to do is make sure that we stay in the game, and I do not feel that the simplistic position put forward by the leader of the third party addresses that in any way. I am certainly going to recommend that we vote against his motion.

Mrs Witmer: I rise today to support the motion by the honourable member for Nipissing, calling on the government to adopt a policy of fiscal restraint to control costs and to provide the opportunity for tax relief.

I share the concern that has been expressed about the tax-and-spend approach to financial management which has dominated the province's fiscal policy for the past five years, an approach which has added to inflationary pressures and reduced the competitiveness of Ontario's industries.

Every day we hear of more and more businesses and companies throughout the province that are closing their doors or laying off their workers. Eddy Match Co in Pembroke, Niagara Structural Steel in St Catharines, Hayes-Dana in Thorold and Stelco Fastener and Forging in Kingston are only a few examples of companies which have announced layoffs over the past couple of weeks. In my own community of Waterloo, we have had business and plant closures including Seagram and B. F. Goodrich. The evidence that this province is no longer competitive and that our economy is in recession is overwhelming.

I believe this government has a responsibility to take immediate action to establish an economic environment that encourages job creation and provides an attractive investment climate for business in Ontario to grow and prosper. It must offer incentives to businesses to create jobs. It must encourage them to locate here or expand their existing operations. It must provide people with the skills and training to become productive employees. As well, this government must make every effort to reduce and control the tax burden on the citizens in our province.

We should be mindful of the 33 Liberal tax hikes of the past five years. These 33 tax hikes contributed to the loss of our ability to compete. Indeed, we should be particularly mindful of the detrimental impact of payroll taxes such as the employer health tax. It was this employer health tax that drove the final nail in the coffin of many small businesses. Payroll taxes are taxes on job creation and are

completely counterproductive to any efforts to maintain and create jobs in this province.

I would urge this government and the Minister of Labour to reject the payroll tax when it introduces the wage protection fund for workers. There are a number of other issues that the Minister of Labour will be addressing in the weeks and months ahead which will increase taxation and the cost of doing business in this province and thus further impact on our ability to compete in the international market.

These include such initiatives as employment and pay equity and the increasing of the minimum wage. While these are all important issues, I would urge the Minister of Labour to carefully consider the economic consequences of these initiatives and the time lines for implementation. If we truly want to encourage businesses to stay or to locate in Ontario to provide those much-needed jobs, we must remember that the imposition of additional taxes and red tape will be counterproductive and will cost us those much needed jobs.

However, it is not only business taxation that hurts our economy. Personal taxation, either through sales tax or income tax, reduces the disposable income of individuals and therefore their ability to contribute to the economy as consumers. Most companies today are citing decreased sales as the reason for layoffs of their employees. Therefore, the purchasing power of consumers is fundamental to the health of our economy.

A policy of restraint to control government expenditure is not only important to the health of our economy; it will also impact on our ability to provide services to our citizens in the future. The Treasurer has stated publicly that he is not worried about the size of our deficit. However, he should be worried about our debt and the yearly deficits which increase that debt. As we all know, if we increase the debt we also increase the cost of servicing that debt. The vicious cycle of expanding deficits and debt that the federal government has put itself into should be a warning to us all.

Currently, the cost of carrying the provincial debt in Ontario consumes a relatively small part of the provincial budget, approximately 9%. I say relatively small as compared to the cost of carrying the federal debt, which is approximately 35%. Let us remember that the federal debt, which is so high, has already significantly reduced Ottawa's ability to provide needed services. If we are not careful in this province, we will soon be in a similar situation. We cannot continue to spend beyond our means. Eventually, the cost of carrying the debts will take up so much of our budget that we will be unable to provide even the most basic services for our citizens, let alone the new services which this government has promised.

I am particularly concerned about the trend to increasing the debt load, because it is our children and our grandchildren who will have to pay for our failure to control our spending. As we all know, debts must be repaid. Reducing or eliminating our debt will not automatically happen when we balance our budget. It will require a number of years of surplus budgets to do so. I do not want to

burden our children with the cost of paying for the services we now receive.

In conclusion, I ask all members to join me in supporting the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party's motion to adopt a policy of restraint to control costs and to provide the opportunity for tax relief. Only if we do so now, can we avoid placing the burden of our debt on the shoulders of future generations.

1710

Mr Bisson: I rise to speak on this motion, because it is quite distressing sitting here on this side of the House—

Mr Elston: It's not that bad.

Mr Bisson: It is beautiful sitting over here. It is a great feeling.

In this motion we are asked to vote on supporting another sort of system, the Conservative fiscal policies that we have in place in Ottawa already.

We have all gone through a particular system for the past four or five years where we have had a government in Ottawa that has tried this type of thing already. They turned around, and what was the first thing they did? Let's see now, the first thing that happened, initially what they talked about was, "Let's dismantle the Foreign Investment Review Agency." That was the first thing. "Let's take away the ability for ourselves as a country to be able to determine how we do business in our own country." So we took that away.

Then there was a policy by which they started to encourage high interest rates. We all know what that is doing to us, what it is doing to the average Ontarian. They went through a whole process of trying to sell us in Ontario and across the rest of this country on the question of free trade.

We on this side of the House, along with some other people in this province and across this country, turned around and started saying what was going to happen with the effects of the free trade agreement. But they would not believe us on that side of the House. They said there were not going to be any effects of free trade.

Let me tell members about a couple of situations we have where I come from, northern Ontario. Two of the biggest iron ore mines in northern Ontario were closed down directly because of that agreement. We are talking about 300 people in each workplace, minimum. Those are 300 families who do not have an income. When those people do not have an income, they do not have the money to put back into the economy of this province. If they have not got that money, what basically happens is that the—

Mrs Cunningham: So what are you going to do about it?

Mr Bisson: Just hang on a second.

What basically happens is that we start to stifle the economy. I think what they are advocating is, "Physician, heal thyself." Tory financial responsibility or Tory fiscal policy is basically to turn around and say, "Listen, what we want to do is leave everything within the private sector," so that the government does not have any responsibility or any role to play in determining what we are going to do when it comes to the way we run this province with regard to the monetary possibilities.

What ends up happening is that we have tried that and it has not worked. What upsets the third party is that it looks at us on this side of the House, and we are saying that for once the people of this province are going to count, for once they are going to have a say. The average person on the street does not have to be a lawyer or an economist—I cannot even say the word—to understand the policies they are talking about, because we are living them today. We have had a government that has implemented that in the federal House and we are having to live with that stuff right now, and it does not work.

The member from the Liberal side of the House mentioned something that was interesting. He talked about the situation in Japan, and I have to agree with him, Japan has been a fine model with regard to what has happened in that economy. But there is a key difference. Japan did something at the very beginning that the member opposite does not recognize: it protected its markets. They protected their markets in order to allow them the time to develop the industry they needed and to be in a position where they could compete on a worldwide basis. The members opposite do not say that to the average person out there. What they are doing is voodoo economics. They are telling the people out there, "Here is a little piece of what we are talking about," and they are not telling them the whole story.

Japan did a couple of other things that are very interesting and something that this government is also attempting to do and we are going to succeed. They believe in the people. They say that in order to have a strong economy, in order to have industry that is strong, you have to have people who have proper education so that the worker out in industry is able to compete and able to adjust to changing times. That takes money, and it has to be done by somebody and it is the government that is going to do it. It is the NDP government that is going to carry out that policy over the next five years.

The other thing they do not say about what happens over there is that there is a much different relationship when it comes to labour, compared to what we have here in Ontario. We have just come out of a bad situation up in my own riding: of a six-month strike where an employer was able to keep employees out of their workplace because of being able to use scab labour. That is something that needs to be addressed.

When labour and management are able to sit down together on an equal footing, not management up here and the worker down there, but on an equal footing, then this province can go ahead and start to compete head to head with anybody.

We have this thing we call—it really amazes me—the level playing field. Yes, that is what it is, the level playing field. It was developed by—what is that guy's name again? Brian Mulroney. He is almost history; I am forgetting his name. Margaret Thatcher—I think he is following her somewhere.

So we have the situation where Brian says, "Okay, we're going to go out and negotiate this deal." He says, "I am a good negotiator, and I am going to set up a level playing field." The theory is okay, there is nothing wrong

with the theory. He says, "I want everything to be equal." It almost sounds like socialism, for God's sake. He says, "I want everything to be equal and I want to be able to have access into the American markets and coming back on an even playing field." Exactly. What ends up happening is something like this: We are now losing jobs in this province at a rate we have never seen before in the history of this province, directly associated with that deal. Why? Because those rules are not even.

Let's just take a little example of one thing that happened. Members opposite do not like listening to this because they do not want people hearing and understanding what is happening out there.

There is a little thing that happened as the free trade agreement was being negotiated that affected the communities in the north quite greatly, that is, the Americans wanted to impose a tariff on the softwood exports going into the American market. Why? Because Canadians were able to compete head to head with any American market. We were able to compete even though we were paying our workers better wages, we were giving them better facilities within the plant with regard to health and safety than in the United States. Our workers had more skills. Our workers had better benefits; if their families became ill they were taken care of. All of those things cost money, but we were still able to compete at a better rate with the Americans when it came to softwood export than anybody else, including inside the United States.

So the Americans said, "Let's put up this tariff so we can block"—it is called protectionism, right?—"the imports of wood coming from Canada into the United States." We have a tough negotiator in Ottawa, Brian M. What does he do?: "No, no don't do it. We'll collect it for you. We have a new tax, another 15%, and we'll collect that so we can just be nice to you guys so you will not impose a tariff so that our free trade agreement will really look like a free trade agreement."

So what we have now is the system federally where they are imposing a tax on softwood exports. When we try to export our softwood stuff into the United States, we are not able to do it because of that 15% tax in the same way we could if it was not there.

So what are we saying we want to do? We are saying to our Conservative friends on the other side of the House: "Please help us. Let's pick up the phone and let's call Brian and let's call the rest of them and let's say to them, 'Listen, we have some real ills inside this economy.'" One of them is that we have to deal with the whole question of the 15% tax on softwood exports into the United States.

The members have the telephone number. Maybe they can call him and say, "Listen, there's a thing called the GST." They are going to be imposing a tax on this province and across the country that is going to add to inflation, and it is going to reduce the amount of money that people have in their pockets. It is very simple economics: If I make \$100 a day working as a worker—and I only have \$20 here because I am not that rich—I have \$100 a day. If what we end up doing is taking more money out of my pocket because of things such as the GST, what is going to end up happening is that I am not

going to have any more money down here to go out and buy the things that I want to buy for my family, and at the same time fuel the economy, put more money into the economy.

What we are saying is that there are some alternatives. We are saying that we have to be fiscally responsible within this province, yes, and that is exactly what we are doing and what we are planning on doing. But there are some other things we have to do at the same time. We must ensure that we have a good system of education to make sure that the workers and the people going into the workforce in this province are able to compete head to head with anybody. If we forget that, we are doomed in the future.

1720

We have to ensure that we have a good system within the province with regard to transportation and communication, so that it is good business to do business here in Ontario, and all of that costs money. But if we leave it strictly to the private sector, because that is what the members opposite are advocating, it is not going to get done.

We are saying quite simply that the government has a key role to play. I think what the people in this province did on 6 September was to look out there at what was available as far as ideology is concerned and what we can bring to this province. It is not to say that Tories are bad or Liberals are bad or New Democrats are bad. We all have something to add to this province; we all have views we can bring to this Legislature. They chose.

They said, "Listen, we realize there needs to be a bigger role played by the government within the province." That is not to say that government is going to go out and tell business what to do, but having a better co-operation than just leaving it to the one sector. That is what they are advocating: They are saying, "Leave it strictly to the private sector to make the decisions of what is going to happen economically inside this province." That is exactly what they are doing.

Mrs Cunningham: You are absolutely wrong.

Mr Bisson: Not at all. They should tell the workers who have lost their jobs in this province over the policies of our federal brothers. They will see.

We are saying there are a couple of key things that have to be done. People have to be able to share in the wealth of this province. One of the ways we can do that is by ensuring that the taxation of money inside this province is done in a fair and equitable manner; that it is not done in a way, as has happened in the past, where the taxes are coming from the people who can least afford to pay them.

At one time we used to have a middle class in this society. We are starting to lose it. Why? Because every time the government of the day decides it is going to levy a tax, it is put on the backs of the working people. That is not just the plant worker or the guy who works for the city or the woman who is a nurse or the doctor or whatever. It is also the managers within industry. It is all kinds of people.

We are all working people; the difference is that we have different jobs. But we cannot just tax that part of the

economy. We have to look elsewhere. We have to turn around and say everybody has a responsibility. And if company X makes \$1 million a year in profits, it should be paying the same kind of tax that I as a private citizen of this province pay, relatively in the same proportion. We should not have a situation where it is only the tax coming out of the pockets of the average working person and hardly anything coming out of the corporate sector.

We are saying there have to be some fair taxes in order to raise the funds to pay for some of the things that need to be done inside this province. I realize that agitates the other side of the House, but that is the reality of what we have.

The last thing I want to say is that I want to challenge our friends on the other side of the House to help us in trying to convince our federal government to do something about the goods and services tax. My colleague on the same side of the House here raised a little while ago that the first thing we did when we came into this House was to say that Bill 1 shall be that we will not collect any money on top of the GST. We are saying, help us. The members have friends there. They are members of their own party; they must have some influence. Help us convince them that this tax is going to hurt this province and people across this country.

Help us do something about interest rates. The interest rates in this province and across the country are affecting not only the working people but also the people who are trying to invest money in this country with regard to trying to build within their own plants. If the money is being lent at too high a rate, there is no way one can afford to do business.

The price of the dollar: We have a situation where the dollar is sitting at a rate that makes it extremely difficult for Ontario and anybody across this country to compete in the US market.

There is no way that I myself am able, and I do not think anybody else on this side of the House is, to support the motion that the member for Nipissing has made, because what he is talking about doing is again going to voodoo economics.

This government is not going to shirk the responsibility of putting in place the legislation and policies that are needed in order to take this province and get it out of this recession in a controlled fashion, not just leaving it to the whims of private individuals.

Mr Mancini: I should point out to the House that the large gathering of people under the Speaker's gallery in the west section actually did not come here today to listen to me. They are here really to meet with our whip, Mr Mahoney; just by chance he mentioned to them that I would be speaking and they insisted that they wanted to be here.

I am anxious to participate in this debate, first, to dismiss the Tory motion. The motion put forward today by the Conservative Party is completely irrelevant. I am going to use this opportunity that has been given to us here in the House to talk about employment, unemployment and things that are actually happening in our community today. I am going to focus my attention on the southwestern On-

tario area. I am the last Liberal member left west of London, actually west of Brant county, so I think it is going to be very important for me to be able to remind the government of the day, that represents so many constituencies in the southwestern Ontario area, about what is happening in their counties and in their ridings. I doubt that many of them will bring forward the facts to the Legislature or to the attention of the appropriate ministers here in the House in the manner in which I am going to do so this afternoon.

I thought I would first put on the record some of the plants that are closing and have announced closings and some of the numbers of people who have lost their jobs. Real people, not statistics, not make-believe companies, not make-believe families, but real companies who had employed real people who supported real families who are now without a job.

On 6 September the people of Ontario made a decision, and we cannot quarrel with the decision the people made. The people are always right and they chose to put in office a new government. On 6 September the responsibilities of government fell to the men and women who sit across the floor from us today. I want to tell them that they now hold the responsibility of power, that they are now accountable for what happens and what does not happen in our communities and they now have the responsibility to ease the pain of people who are losing their jobs, to ease the pain of families, some of whom for the first time are beginning to know what distress is.

1730

In Elgin county, according to the London Free Press, Therm-O-Disc of St Thomas is going to close. It was reported on 12 October 1990 that the president of Therm-O-Disc announced that 100 jobs would be eliminated over the next three months. The plant would cease production in mid-1992, putting a total of 300 people out of work. I want to know what the response of the government is to the tragedy that is facing these 300 people.

In Middlesex county, D and C Roussy Industries Ltd has announced that 62 London-area workers would lose their jobs. On 5 October, D and C Roussy Industries was placed in receivership and the workers were given their pink slips: 62 more real people put out of work, 62 more real families affected.

Somerville Packaging in London: On 10 September 1990, it was announced that Somerville Packaging's Crumlin Side Road plant would close on 30 November. Operations would be phased out, with gradual layoffs of approximately 150 employees. That plant had been producing specialty and industrial packaging for more than 40 years.

Commonwealth Hospitality of London: The Canada Employment Centre office in London informed me that the London regional office of this company is closing on 31 December 1990. Commonwealth Hospitality is the corporate arm of Holiday Inn. It will be consolidated with the Toronto office, putting 35 people out of work. We want to hear from the members who represent these communities just as aggressively today as we heard from them prior to 6 September. That is their responsibility now.

Travelaire Ltd of Strathroy: Travelaire's Strathroy plant closed on 12 October 1990, I want to tell the Minister of Labour. Some 90 people were affected by this closure.

Omstead Foods of Wheatley: The Canada Employment Centre office informed me that as of 16 November, the fish plant closed. Some 60 people are out of work, and I expect the new member for Essex-Kent to be fighting in cabinet for these 60 people who have lost their livelihoods.

Hon Mr Cooke: What are you doing?

Mr Mancini: "What am I doing?" one of the members across the floor asks. I am cataloguing for the new government the pain that is being felt by real people, the suffering that real families are going through, the bleak Christmas and the bleak New Year that hundreds of families will be facing. Some of these people faintly remember the promises that were made by the new government during the last election campaign. I will continue to stand in my place and speak for these people who are suffering, who have received their pink slips, who have been told that they are no longer useful at their place of employment, for whatever reason. They will have a voice in this Legislature, and it will be up to the government of the day to ease the pain, to ensure that the promises they made before 6 September were not hollow promises but were in fact things that they had thoughtfully considered and knew they could put in place after they assumed the responsibility of power.

I wish the new government well. I want them to be able to look after the concerns of our citizens who are at the present time not having the best of luck, the best opportunity or whose futures look bleak.

Standard Tube in Blenheim: Standard Tube's Blenheim plant closed on 28 September 1990.

Approximately 170 hourly and salaried workers lost their jobs. The new government needs to act, and if the members already want to give up their responsibilities of government, it is easy to do so. They fought very hard to obtain the responsibility of government, exercise the power that the people of Ontario bestowed upon them. They should exercise that power. That is their responsibility. These people have lost their jobs. They have entrusted the government with their future. They expect it to look after them.

Closer to my home riding of Essex South and the Windsor area, I want to tell members that we have suffered greatly.

I will list the number of plants that have closed since 6 September. I will deal with Windsor first, because I know that the cabinet minister from Windsor has been a fighter for people from Windsor. He has been a fighter for the unemployed, and on a regular basis he stood on this side of the House, I say to my friends across the floor, and asked the government of the day to do what it could for people who received pink slips and whose futures were changed by decisions made by management or by others.

Canadian ASE has announced that 83 jobs are gone; Welles Canada and Wayne Canada, 100 jobs gone; Toledo Scale, 36 jobs gone; Kelsey-Hayes, which will close on 2 November, 300-plus jobs gone; Family Home Automation,

closing in December, 68 jobs gone; the Ford plant in Windsor—14 December is the day for it—535 jobs gone.

Interjections.

Mr Mancini: Why am I being heckled so fiercely because I am presenting to the floor of the House actual data describing the plight of our people and their families in our communities? I cannot understand why it is so noisy from the other side, when all I want to do is put on the record of the Ontario Legislature the number of people and families that are suffering.

In Kent county: Hunt-Wesson closing 21 November, 60 jobs gone; Nabisco of Leamington, 90 jobs gone; Delta '70 Manufacturing in Harrow and in Kingsville less than two weeks ago announced their closures, 150 jobs gone.

I want to remind the government of the day that it has a grave responsibility. They control the Legislature, they have a sizeable majority, they have many experienced men and women in their cabinet—maybe not experienced in government, maybe not experienced in sitting in the Legislature, but they have men and women sitting in their caucus and in their cabinet who have real-life experience that they could use to the benefit of the people whom I am talking about.

I say to those men and women who are in government today that we are counting on them; the people who have lost their jobs, the plants that I articulated here this afternoon that are closing—those people and those families are counting on them.

I want to remind my friend the member for Windsor-Riverside what happened on 7 June 1990, when 2,000 people had demonstrated in Windsor against the government "because of lack of proper plant closure legislation." The member for Windsor-Riverside was in the Legislature and he said to the government of the day—this is on page 1667, for all the members who would like to read those particular pages—"Does the minister not realize that if he does not bring in up-to-date...plant closure legislation that provides for public justification," the situation will get worse, leaving the impression that a New Democratic Party government would be able to put in place plant closure legislation that could keep plants from closing. Many people believed the New Democratic Party.

On 8 May 1989, Hansard page 337, the present Minister of Labour stated, "There are a number of other bills I would commend to the House again, such as the one to amend the Employment Standards Act to provide a public audit board to require plant closure justification," leaving the impression that a New Democratic Party government would in fact, through this public audit board, have the power to prevent plant closures.

1740

During the campaign the New Democratic Party issued *An Agenda for People*, a pertinent page of which I have with me this afternoon on plant closures. The Treasurer nods that yes, this is the document he stood behind during the election. We say to him that we want him to stand behind that document today. It says, "A jobs protection board would establish whether plant closures are jus-

tified," meaning such a board could in fact prevent plant closures from taking place.

I know they do not like this, but I want to tell the new government members that people in my constituency who have lost their jobs like it even less. They like it even less.

I want to put on the record—I have only a minute and 52 seconds left—some of the things that real people have said in response to the plant closures, in response to their pink slips, in response to their walking papers.

Chris Rocheleau of Harrow was laid off from Delta Manufacturing only a couple of weeks ago—but they are counting on the government to help them—Gino Denunzio of the same plant; Gordon Beaudoin of Harrow, the same plant; Arnold Christian, the same plant, Delta Manufacturing; Mark Sniveley, Delta Manufacturing. These people have lost their jobs. They have got their pink slips. They are waiting for plant closure justification.

Gordon Beaudoin, a 50-year-old man, said finding another job will be tough if he cannot get his spot at Harrow back. "I've got 18 years seniority and I'm 50. Where am I going to get a job?"

The mayor of Harrow, Peter Timmins, said the closure is a big loss to the town. The mayor of Kingsville, Jim Gaffan, said his town does not need to lose another plant.

I want to tell members what the people who lost their jobs at Nabisco had to say and I want the new government members who are now eminently comfortable in their seats to listen, because these people are not comfortable.

Brenda Balkwill of Leamington, a 31-year-old unmarried mother of a small boy and expecting a second child in January, said—

The Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, I want to wind up by saying that these people are looking for the government's help. They are looking for action from the New Democratic Party government.

Mrs Cunningham: I am not a bit surprised to hear the response of both the Liberal members and the NDP members this afternoon in their advice that they will not—

Mr Mancini: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think it is highly unfair for any member of the assembly, when another member is talking about real people and real families who are suffering, who have lost their jobs, to send that member a pink slip. That shows a callousness that I have not seen in the Legislature for a long, long time.

The Speaker: The member is correct that it is not amusing.

Mrs Cunningham: I would like 30 more seconds, please. That is what we lost on the clock.

I am not a bit surprised to see that the Liberal members in the Legislative Assembly this afternoon and the NDP members will not be supporting what I think is a very clear policy that all of us in this House should be very concerned about. It simply says "to adopt a policy of restraint to control costs and to provide the opportunity for tax relief."

Later on this evening I am speaking to a small business group in London, Ontario, and the first sentence will be

that this province today has a consolidated public sector debt of \$71 billion. That is almost twice our budget.

I have young children in my family who want to get the jobs we have been talking about today. They are going to be faced, more than any other generation in the history of this province, with the biggest debt to pay back in a lifetime, and we stand here today smiling and laughing about a policy that says, "Let's have some tax relief for these same small business people who keep our children and our families employed and let's try to manage our offices efficiently."

I notice that the member for Essex South has left.

Mr Mancini: I'm here.

Mrs Cunningham: Oh, he is here. I do not have time to go through his list, but I will refer to the first two.

The first company he mentioned was Roussy from London. They went out of business. Why? I represent my constituency. They went out of business because the Liberals could not come up with a policy about the length of trailers. Their orders were cancelled and all those people lost their jobs.

Somerville Packaging is the next one. That is a paperboard company with offices right across Canada and the United States, and the union contract that was negotiated in London was the highest in Canada and the United States and it simply put them out of business—unrealistic expectations from the workers. That does happen. Let's face it. The members know it.

From time to time we have a responsibility in this House to be responsible to the taxpayers of this province and to keep our people working. If we are not competitive, it will not happen. Those were two examples. We can spend more time.

During the last election, the public came before us and said, "We can't take it any more." The tax that really got the small businesses that I am going to be speaking to tonight was the employer health tax. That was one of 32 new taxes in the five-year term of the Liberal government in this province. Either face it or do not face it. I will tell members that it is the fact. We have to take more responsibility on what we ask little people to pay out of their paycheques, the sons and daughters of members, as mine, who have graduated from university and who are lucky, some of them, to get a job at \$20,000. This government is taking something like \$7,000 or \$8,000 away from them. Worse than that are the young people who attend our school system, who cannot get the training programs we talked about today because we have not been providing them for the past 10 years.

All governments are responsible, and the New Democratic Party was elected for the first time in this province to come up with solutions. But they stood here in the House this afternoon as members of the government did, without providing solutions, which I must admit our party is going to try to do. We will help them if they will listen. They promised. They said they would listen.

I gave some solutions as did some of my colleagues in our questions this afternoon. The Minister of Education is nodding her head; others can speak for themselves. None of us are elected to this Legislative Assembly to poke fun at other levels of government. We have a responsibility.

This particular motion simply says, "Let's have a responsible solution for the former tax and spend approach to government of the Liberals." The government should be helping the public of Ontario, as government, in the next five years, and we will all be hoping that it really does.

1750

Mr Jamison: I am very pleased to be a newly elected member of this House, and I am pleased to be here to represent the riding of Norfolk. I am here to speak on the motion by the leader of the third party. The motion itself I consider to be one that is frivolous, on the basis that this province has elected a New Democratic government for the first time in its history to represent the people of this province in a different manner and to address the problems that quite simply have not been addressed in the past.

I have listened to the debate today. I find that I simply cannot help but comment on the motion itself, where it comes from and what it is about. The motion itself comes from a party that is trying to distance itself from a federal party that is on the way, with its policies, to the ruining of this very province and this country that we live in. Prior to my election, I could not find out whether the third party was in favour of the GST, opposed to the GST or whether it knew what the GST was.

It was also very quiet on the real effects of free trade on this province and on our ability to generate jobs and employment, subject to that uneven playing field we are experiencing today.

One of the previous speakers talked about us having a feel for working people. I do. I worked in a basic industry for 20 years. I would ask the member the same question. I am here to represent the working men and working women of this province. This motion was designed specifically to curtail our ability as the duly elected government of this province to do our job. Our job is quite simply to react to the situation in the time and space we find ourselves in. What we have done is we have put forward in a very few, short days some very, very forward-looking legislation.

I have sat quietly, listening intently to what the official opposition has to say and what the third party has to say. I cannot say it has been constructive at all. We are putting forward an agenda for people. Yes, we are. We have four and a half years, a mandate that the people of this province gave us, clearly to implement that agenda.

I know that the riding I come from really is a microcosm of this province—fishing, basic industry, subauto-related industry, agriculture. I can tell members, by talking to people of my riding, that they are very pleased with the direction and the course we have taken. They are pleased that our Premier has taken the time to

consider very carefully, subject to the time and space we are in, the direction we must take.

We have taken a direction to ensure that the infrastructure of this province is sound coming out of a recession. I congratulate the Treasurer for making that decision. We have taken the time to consult, which I can say very clearly at this present time I cannot recall being done very efficiently in the past in this province. Consulting and listening to people is part and parcel of the reason we are here. I am proud of where I came from. I came from basic industry. I have watched the devastation going on as far as basic industry's ability to compete is concerned under the free trade agreement, never mind small and mid-sized industry that seems to find it convenient all of a sudden to head for the border a year after the fact of free trade. I would like to compliment the Treasurer on his performance.

In referring to the motion put forward, we are very aware that unemployment is rising. We are very aware at the same time that the social assistance case load and the costs of social assistance programs are on the rise. We understand that the inflationary pressures are there, created by the policies of a government that is not in tune with the people of this country.

When I see the third party put forward a motion like this, I have to ask myself, if they are talking about doing the things that are right for the people of this country and this province, they would come out and stand up and be counted strongly against the impending GST. I have not heard that. They would be recognizing what has happened under the free trade agreement. They would be recognizing clearly what the root cause is, because we may be into a global kind of recession shortly. But it has been fully impacted further by the actions of the federal government.

This government will take the time to make sure that the things we do, under the restraint that we are obviously under with a \$2.5-billion deficit, will have a real effect on the people of this province. Because of that, I know the motion will fail.

1805

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes—15

Arnott, Carr, Cousens, Cunningham, Eves, Harnick, Jackson, Marland, Sterling, Stockwell, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

Nays—82

Abel, Akande, Allen, Beer, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Chiarelli, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Curling, Dadamo, Daigeler, Duignan, Elston, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grandmaître, Haack, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Henderson, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kwinter, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard;

Mackenzie, Mahoney, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Mancini, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, McGuinty, Mills, Morin, Morrow, Murdock, S., Nixon, North, O'Connor, O'Neill, Y., Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Phillips, G., Poole, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Ruprecht, Silipo, Sola, Sullivan, Sutherland, Swarbrick, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Wessinger, White, Wilson, G., Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Miss Martel: I would like to advise the House of the business for next week.

On Monday 3 December, we will continue the debate on the speech from the throne. At approximately 5:45 there will be a vote on the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the throne.

On Tuesday 4 December, we will have an opposition day standing in the name of the member for Halton Centre.

On Wednesday 5 December and Thursday 6 December, we will begin second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

The House adjourned at 1812.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Thursday 29 November 1990

Members' statements		
Crawford Rose	2281	
Mr Beer		
Layoffs	2281	
Mr J. Wilson		
Town of East Gwillimbury	2281	
Mr O'Connor		
Environmental assessment	2281	
Mr McGuinty		
Air quality	2282	
Mr Carr		
Health services	2282	
Mr Morrow		
Drug abuse	2282	
Mr Ruprecht		
Living wills	2283	
Mr Sterling		
Child care	2283	
Ms Haslam		
Statements by the ministry		
Protection of in-care residents	2283	
Ms Ziemba		
Social assistance	2283	
Mrs Akande		
Responses		
Social assistance	2284	
Mr Beer		
Protection of in-care residents	2285	
Mr Phillips		
Social assistance	2285	
Mr Jackson		
Protection of in-care residents	2285	
Mr Jackson		
Oral questions		
Nuclear power	2285	
Mr Conway		
Mrs Carter		
Mr McGuinty		
Rent regulation	2286	
Ms Poole		
Mr Cooke		
Goods and services tax	2287	
Mr Harris		
Mr Rae		
Government policies	2288	
Mr Harris		
Mr Rae		
Post-secondary education financing	2288	
Mr Daigeler		
Mr Allen		
Rent regulation	2289	
Mr Tilson		
Mr Rae		
Affordable housing	2289	
Mr Duignan		
Mr Cooke		
Oak Ridges moraine	2290	
Mrs Caplan		
Mr Cooke		
Technical education	2290	
Mrs Cunningham		
Mrs Boyd		
Police services	2291	
Mr Wessenger		
Mr Farnan		
Police legislation	2291	
Mr Curling		
Mr Farnan		
Budget	2292	
Mr Stockwell		
Mr Laughren		
Government policies	2292	
Mr Harris		
Mr Rae		
Assisted housing	2293	
Mr Mammoliti		
Mr Cooke		
Conduct of cabinet ministers	2293	
Mr Mahoney		
Mr Rae		
Petitions		
Violence against women	2294	
Mr Eves		
Water and sewage utility	2294	
Mr Wiseman		
First readings		
Restoule Snowmobile Club Act, 1990, Bill Pr9	2294	
Mr Eves		
Agreed to	2294	
La Capanna Homes (Non-Profit) Inc Act, 1990,		
Bill Pr48	2294	
Mr Ferguson		
Agreed to	2294	
Alarm Systems Act, 1990, Bill 5	2294	
Mr McLean		
Agreed to	2294	

Heritage Day Act, 1990, Bill 6	2294
Mr McLean	
Agreed to	2294
Goderich-Exeter Railway Company Limited Act, 1990,	
Bill Pr 22	2294
Mr Klopp	
Agreed to	2294
Lordina Limited Act, 1990, Bill Pr45	2294
Mr Eves	
Agreed to	2294
Powers of Attorney Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 7 . . .	2294
Mr Sterling	
Agreed to	2294
Natural Death Act, 1990, Bill 8	2294
Mr Sterling	
Agreed to	2294

Opposition day

Government spending, motion 1	2295
Mr Harris	2295
Mr Laughren	2297

Mr Nixon	2299
Mr Stockwell	2301
Mr Christopherson	2304
Mr Kwinter	2305
Mrs Witmer	2307
Mr Bisson	2308
Mr Mancini	2310
Mrs Cunningham	2312
Mr Jamison	2313
Negatived	2314

Other business

Estimates	2281
Ms Lankin	
Business of the House	2314
Miss Martel	
Adjournment	2314

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	2315
---	------

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000



63 1990

63 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 3 December 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 3 décembre 1990

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 3 December 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

BICENTENARY EXPEDITION

Mrs McLeod: A very exciting project has been under way in Thunder Bay for some three years now. Students of the Outdoor Recreation program at Lakehead University, in co-operation with the One Step Beyond Adventure group and the Alexander Mackenzie Trail Association, are recreating the historic voyages of Sir Alexander Mackenzie. They have already duplicated Mackenzie's voyage to the Arctic and are preparing to follow his route from Montreal to the Pacific to celebrate the 1993 bicentenary of the first recorded crossing of the North American continent.

This is a significant project because this is a time, perhaps more than ever before, to remember both Canada's native inhabitants and the courageous entrepreneurs who envisioned this nation as stretching from sea to sea, a time for the provinces and Canada to work together for our shared heritage.

The Minister of Education has written a strong letter of endorsement of this project, clearly recognizing how much it can mean in enhancing awareness and understanding of our heritage. The project does, however, require funding. Unless \$200,000 is received by 31 December, the expedition plans will be cancelled. The private sector, federal government and other provinces have all made a commitment. I would ask the Minister of Education to ensure that her ministry and the Ministry of Culture and Communications act quickly to provide financial support so that this important project can proceed.

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Jordan: It is not news to anyone that the previous provincial government destroyed its relationship with local government. It is, however, discouraging to see that trend continue under the current government.

Municipalities in eastern Ontario and across the province are tired of hearing about wonderful new schemes that have been developed in the boardrooms of Queen's Park. Governments have been downloading on municipalities for too long.

For example, the previous government wanted to beef up court security across the province. The main thing they did not think of was who was going to fund the program. Municipal police forces were not large enough to supply the manpower and municipalities sure could not foot the bill.

The Minister of Community and Social Services has announced that an increase in general welfare will cost municipalities 20% of the additional \$91 million that she has allotted, and that because local governments were not consulted the province will pay the cost in 1991. What

happens in 1992? Will the minister assure our eastern Ontario municipalities that they will not have to pay for her magnanimous gesture?

TRIBUTES

Mr Fletcher: Mr Speaker, congratulations on your election. I would also like to pay homage to the two members who preceded me in this House, Harry Worton and also Rick Ferraro, who worked hard in this Legislature.

I would also like to pay tribute to three people from Guelph: trustee Virginia Parker, who is a long-standing member of the Wellington County Board of Education and who has worked very hard on the affirmative action committee and also on the nuclear awareness program; George King, who developed a co-operative education program in Guelph that became the envy of the city and the province and who was seconded by the Ministry of Education in order to develop the program throughout Ontario; and also Dr Taylor Evans, who is a past chairperson and vice-chairperson of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and past chairperson of the Wellington County Board of Education, who worked many years as a trustee, one of the longest-sitting members in Ontario as a trustee. Their passing is going to be sadly missed not only in Ontario and in Guelph but also in the area of education.

TRANSPORTATION IN MISSISSAUGA

Mr Mahoney: I would like to bring to the attention of the Legislature an important transportation initiative being undertaken by the city of Mississauga.

The city is planning a busway to be located in the Highway 403-Parkway Belt corridor which, when constructed, will become an integral part of the greater Toronto area transit network. The busway will be a form of rapid transit, a two-lane road on which only transit vehicles travel, thereby ensuring that they can move without restriction and quickly to points throughout Mississauga and beyond.

It is a flexible concept. Buses are a convenient, cost-effective mode of transport and can be converted to cleaner, more efficient fuels such as natural gas in the future.

In late 1989 a busway study was undertaken to examine the possible route alignment and station locations for this facility. The study will conclude in the spring of 1991 at which time the preferred routes and station locations will be recommended to council.

In the \$5-billion Let's Move package announced by the Liberal government in April 1990, this busway was one of the projects specifically named. It was on that basis that the city of Mississauga proceeded and a considerable investment has already been made. There is now some concern on the part of the city that the present government may not fulfil these financial commitments. I would urge this government to live up to the commitments made by the former Liberal government.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr Cousens: I am pleased to share with all members in this House a copy of Markham's recycling book. This is a book that has been developed by Markham's own committee on waste management and it is an exciting way of going about solving the problems of waste within a community. I say exciting because our whole community is buying into the need of being involved in reduction and recycling.

We now have one pickup per week within the community, house to house, for garbage pickup. We are also in a position where the Markham Stouffville Hospital is part of the whole recycling effort. We have two hotels that have bought into it and are working hard to reduce their waste, both the Valhalla and Chimo hotels. Two condominiums in Thornhill, the Summit and the Gazebo, have reduced their garbage pickup needs by over 50% in the last three years. We are talking about the whole community becoming involved in this and I see it as something where everybody has to take an important role in this whole environmental matter.

My compliments to the chairman of the committee, Councillor Bob Sherwood, and to Councillor Ken Dunphy and Regional Councillor Gord Landon, and also to the waste management co-ordinator, Jeanette Annbinder.

We are pleased to be part of this whole effort as part of Ontario, saying, "Let's do something more," and this is just one example of one community that is committed to it. I hope that when other communities see this they will rise to the challenge and might even come up with a new idea that Markham did not have.

1340

ILLITERACY

Mr Beer: There are as many as five million people in Canada who are functionally illiterate. This means they cannot read signs, fill out job applications, read medicine bottles or read the daily newspaper. A study undertaken in 1987 found that illiteracy costs Canada about \$4.5 billion annually.

Illiteracy means extra workers' compensation payments, accidents caused by people unable to read operating and safety instructions, absenteeism and lost productivity. It also means a loss of dignity for those people who are illiterate. Most people want to contribute as much as they can at their workplace and in society. People who are illiterate are unable to do this. Though the pain is most severe for those who are illiterate, we all suffer from this loss of human potential.

Fortunately, there are some attempts to solve this problem. The previous Liberal government brought forth a number of positive initiatives to celebrate 1990 as the United Nations International Year of Literacy. The Liberal government announced a workplace strategy that was launched in January 1990, and \$3 million was allocated to various special programs over two years.

There are also actions being taken on a local level. I recently had the privilege of addressing the Literacy Council York-Simcoe. This council has done some very impor-

tant work to try to help the estimated 20,000 York region residents who suffer from illiteracy.

The United Nations year of literacy is coming to an end, but we have heard nothing yet from the new government concerning what it intends to do. The new government must not only continue the programs that the previous government brought in for literacy year; it must also bring in significant new programs immediately to help people to escape the vicious cycle of illiteracy.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr McLean: My statement is for the Minister of Natural Resources. The minister is no doubt aware that approximately 75% of this province is covered by forests and 85% of that forested area is crown land. In 1980, logging companies were given 20-year logging licences which made them responsible for renewing any areas logged. Compliance is reviewed every five years.

There are many things happening in the logging industry. There still exists the public perception that forests are being mismanaged. There are public fears about the practice of clear-cutting, the method of tree harvesting that involves the removal of entire swaths of forest, as well as proposals to cut some of the last stands of old-growth forest in Ontario.

The Ontario Forest Industries Association has asked the government to appoint independent auditors to investigate the industry's compliance to regulatory practices. There are very real public concerns about current forest regulations which emphasize the extraction of wood fibre over tourism and wildlife concerns. There are very real public concerns that industry clear-cutting is destroying the long-term productivity of our forests.

I urge the minister to support the call for independent auditors. I would recommend that the auditors include representation from environmental groups to give us a more balanced picture of the forest industry practices.

FIRE PREVENTION

Mr Huget: On 5 October 1990 the Solicitor General announced that the Rotary Club of Sarnia had won an Ontario Fire Prevention and Public Education Award. Ontario's fire prevention and public education awards acknowledge those whose innovative and practical programs may contribute to a reduction in loss of life and limit property damage. This is the third consecutive year that the Rotary Club of Sarnia has received an award.

The Rotary Club of Sarnia provided funding to the Lambton county firefighters to implement a fire survival program for schoolchildren. The donation was used to purchase a van, a smoke machine and other equipment that help firefighters teach children how to escape from a burning building. The realistic fire drills require children to plan their escape and reinforce the importance of smoke alarms.

Each year the Ministry of the Solicitor General gives awards during Fire Prevention Week to Ontario residents in groups who have demonstrated outstanding achievement, courage and ongoing commitment to fire prevention and public fire safety education. I would like to thank the

citizens of Sarnia for their generous support of the Rotary Club and their interest in and contribution to this important program.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX LA TAXE SUR LES PRODUITS ET LES SERVICES

Hon Miss Martel: I am pleased to rise today to bring to members' attention an interprovincial report on the impact of the goods and services tax and other federal tax measures on northern jurisdictions. My ministry is releasing this report today.

At a 1989 conference in Val d'Or, Quebec, provincial and territorial ministers responsible for northern development commissioned this report, entitled *Concerns Regarding the Implications of the Recent Tax Measures for the Economies of the North*. It evaluates the impact of the GST on the northern part of Canada and assesses the proposed changes to the northern tax allowance.

The report shows clearly that these federal initiatives will have a negative impact on low-income households, on small businesses and on manufacturers in the northern part of Canada's provinces and in the territories.

The report states that the goods and services tax will reduce the purchasing power of northern consumers and add to the cost of northern manufactured goods and tourism services.

Northern manufacturers will face special challenges because transportation costs will be taxed under the GST. This will lead to an increased incentive to manufacture goods close to the market and will put northern businesses at a disadvantage.

The GST will also reduce demand for the northern tourism industry by raising the cost of visiting that part of our country. Northern tourism is heavily dependent upon transportation and the tax will make that travel more costly.

Municipalities, universities, hospitals and schools in the north will also bear higher overall costs under the GST. Rebates for these institutions are based on a single national calculation which will not be sufficient to compensate for the additional costs associated with a northern location.

The report further states that the impact of the GST on the costs of transportation, energy and housing in the north will be felt by every northern resident. The expenditures for transportation and energy are higher in the north and they will become more costly as a result of the GST.

The report recommends that GST credits for institutions, new home buyers and low-income families in the north be adjusted to reflect the higher northern costs. It also suggests reducing excise and transportation related taxes in order to offset higher heating and transportation costs in the north.

Enfin, le Rapport sur les inquiétudes concernant les répercussions des récentes mesures fiscales sur les économies du Nord critique les conclusions de la commission Brunelle en ce qui a trait au dégrèvement d'impôt consenti aux résidents du Nord. Cette commission, mise

sur pied par le gouvernement fédéral, recommande de n'accorder de déductions fiscales qu'aux collectivités situées à l'extrémité nord du pays.

Une telle mesure signifierait qu'en Ontario, seuls les résidents de la localité de Moosonee y seraient encore admissibles, de même que les Indiens de plein droit de 19 réserves indiennes dont les revenus sont déjà exempts d'impôt. Les résidents de nombreuses collectivités du Nord de l'Ontario — Hornepayne, Pickle Lake et Manitouwadge, pour n'en citer que quelques-unes — ne pourraient plus se prévaloir de cet avantage fiscal.

The report states that communities which are very isolated, lack essential services and have difficulty recruiting labour, especially teachers and health care professionals, would lose approximately \$20 million annually.

It suggests that the provinces should be further consulted in order to establish more equitable boundaries and that those communities losing tax credits be compensated with more economic development assistance.

A number of other recent federal tax and fiscal measures that are having a negative impact on the north are also outlined in the report. These include funding for regional development, tightening of the unemployment insurance benefits and the elimination of the Canadian exploration incentive program.

I want to emphasize that the GST on its own is the wrong tax at the wrong time for northern Ontarians and that the GST, combined with other insensitive federal measures, is absolutely unacceptable to this government.

This federal tax grab is being imposed on a region whose residents can least afford a reduction in their take-home income. We will continue to voice our opposition to this destructive federal initiative.

1350

RESPONSES

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr Miclash: I must say that for the first statement by the Minister of Northern Development I expected much more. We know there are a number of ways that the GST is going to affect northern Ontario. We know that with the increase in gas prices, the increase in various prices for accommodation, tourism is going to be greatly affected. We know these things, but we want to know what this government is going to do for northern Ontario. So far all they have indicated is that they were going to reduce the retail sales tax and harmonize it with the GST. I do not think that is good enough.

We were expecting more in the throne speech in terms of what this government was going to do for northern Ontario. They like to talk about the fact that we do have six ministers from northern Ontario. We are looking for those six ministers to do something, to actually come across with good statements that are going to tell us what the economy of northern Ontario is going to be like once they have their policies in gear.

We were ignored in the throne speech. I think today all we have is rehashing of what the federal government is going to do to affect us in terms of the GST. We heard the

Premier in Sudbury recently announce that the northern Ontario people will have to wait to find out what this government is going to do. I suggest to the new government that we have waited long enough. We are looking for direction; we are looking for policies that are going to bring positive results to northern Ontario. I suggest that what has been stated today is not what we were looking for from the Minister of Northern Development, no direction as to where we in northern Ontario can expect this new minister to take us.

Mr Stockwell: We certainly did not need a report of this length and magnitude to figure out exactly what was in fact taking place in northern Ontario. Clearly it is a GST-bashing period, which is certainly understandable, considering the party. The fact still remains that according to An Agenda for People there is a tremendous amount, apparently, that the minister's party in fact could be doing, a tremendous amount of input the minister can have to effect change. What has the minister done? Well, absolutely nothing.

The minister stood up here today and she bashed and she bashed and she bashed. The fact of the matter is that this government is not used to being out of opposition. It does not have to keep bashing. It can do something about it. Maybe it could go ahead and begin the \$200 million or so for the northern fund that it promised during the election. What is the matter with announcing that program? Or is this government out of money? Maybe it could go ahead and talk about the \$100 million it promised for four-laning the highway. Maybe it could do that; maybe it could make that announcement today in conjunction with this particular announcement. Those would be good ideas. Those would be ideas that people in northern Ontario would welcome. But no, we do not hear that. We hear more bashing. We do not even hear of consultation in this minister's statement. All we hear is bashing.

Continuing with the gasoline prices this government whined about for years, the public gouging, why does this government not do something about that? We know this government whined about it. It has an opportunity to do something about it. Nothing. We get a report and standing up here condemning the GST and throwing their arms up and saying there is nothing they can do about it. Why does this government not do something about the issues? Why does it not take the lead like a government should?

Finally, with regard to the \$700 million this government's Treasurer announced—which is such an obvious ploy that he stated himself that of the \$700 million only \$25 million would in fact be used this year to open up projects or go ahead with projects that will help the economy—why does this government not spend it in northern Ontario? Why does this government not give the opportunity to spend some of this \$700-million promise it made and hopefully regenerate a sagging economy?

We all know there are problems with the economy. We all know there are people out there who are in fact having difficulty getting along. We do not need the minister reading public statements telling them that. What we need is action, and maybe some action fulfilling the promises that this government made to the people, which I think maybe

they had the misfortune of believing, and that may be the problem we have today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

RENT REVIEW

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Premier. In the fall of 1989 he was asked what his solution was to the rental housing crisis, and he replied that the structure of ownership must be changed. In a quote that was put on the record last Thursday by the member for Dufferin-Peel, which I feel is important enough to repeat, he said: "You make it less profitable for people to own it," referring to rental housing. "I would bring in a very rigid, tough system of rent review....There will be a huge squawk from the speculative community, and you say to them, 'If you are unhappy, we will buy you out.'"

Can the Premier confirm that that is his policy and that that is still his view and that his Minister of Housing's recent rental review announcement is the first step in implementing his stated aim of removing rental stock from private ownership?

Hon Mr Rae: No. What I can tell the Leader of the Opposition is that the policy of the government is the policy that was announced by the Minister of Housing last week. This policy allows for increases, it allows for a reasoned approach. It also allows and recognizes that there have to be short-term steps taken to provide some protection for tenants. Then we will engage, as we have already stated, in a dialogue with tenants, landlords and all other groups involved, in producing a long-term policy.

I would also remind the Leader of the Opposition that this issue has been before the House on many occasions. It has been in the Legislature for 15 years, and each time a change has been contemplated, both in the initial phases under the previous Progressive Conservative administration and then under a Liberal administration, there was a recognition that there had to be steps taken to provide some protection for tenants. We certainly believe that the current system is not working very well. I will say to him that the policy of the government and the purposes of the policy of the government are as set out by the Minister of Housing in his statement last week.

Mr Nixon: I am interested in the Premier's answer, of course. I am not sure whether it means he has disavowed his previous statement that I just read into the record, which I see as his own personal view that private enterprise has no place in housing under these circumstances.

As there are approximately one million units owned and operated by the private sector, I am informed, should he not make it abundantly clear that the solution to our housing problem is surely a partnership between the government and those people who are prepared to invest in this regard and not simply a renunciation of what the honourable Premier might consider a capitalistic intrusion into the provision of this essential service?

Hon Mr Rae: I think the Leader of the Opposition should know, and I am sure that in his heart of hearts he does know, that the current system of so-called rent review

has created a great many problems for a great many tenants. I am sure that in his heart of hearts he knows that, because as Treasurer he must have listened to a number of concerns raised, I am sure, within his own caucus by some colleagues who are here now who have raised concerns about how the previous system was not working.

Now that is an experience we have had to contend with and, I will say to him, in a very balanced way. We have a mixed economy, we have an economy which aspires to be democratic and to be fair, and that is the economy for which our government is now responsible during the period of stewardship which it has been granted by the people of the province.

I can assure him that I believe in fairness, I believe in a mixed economy. I would even say to the former Treasurer that I think there is a need for us to have a discussion that is widespread. I say to the Leader of the Opposition that we are going to be having that discussion, that the steps which were announced by the Minister of Housing in my view are reasonable steps. They are necessary steps for the protection of tenants and they are designed to provide that degree of protection and that degree of fairness which we believe is necessary. They are not arbitrary in any way. We believe they are designed to work. I say to the leader that this is the agenda which has been put forward by the government.

1400

Mr Kwinter: By way of supplementary, the Premier will be aware of the Friday 30 November advertisement in the Wall Street Journal denouncing the Premier's rental housing policy, an advertisement, I hasten to add, which I thought was totally irresponsible. Having said that, the fact of the matter is that the ad is out there.

This is the actual size of the ad that appeared in the Wall Street Journal. The heading says, "Investors Beware!" and the tagline says, "If you once thought Ontario was a safe place to invest, think again!"

Considering the millions and millions of dollars and the efforts we have spent over the years trying to convince American investors to put their money into Ontario, could the Premier tell me what he plans to do to counteract this negative impression that is not only out in the United States, but because of the widespread circulation of the Wall Street Journal, will be international?

Hon Mr Rae: If anybody had not read the ad, the member has done his best to make sure that others will be aware of it. I would just like to read to him a letter I received over the weekend from the chairman and chief executive officer of ScotiaMcLeod Inc. Austin Taylor is not somebody who is a member of the New Democratic Party, as I am sure the member for Wilson Heights will indicate. I want members to know what he said because I think it provides a basis from which to respond to the question.

"Dear Premier: I felt it important to comment on the enclosed advertisement of the 30 November edition of the Wall Street Journal, placed by AFFORD, Association for Furthering Ontario's Rental Development, which is patently scurrilous, harmful to our province, and stupid.

"The point I wish to make to you, Premier, is that however tempting it may be, please do not judge the Ontario business community by the senseless and unfair behaviour of AFFORD.

"I am confident that you and your caucus will rise above AFFORD's gutter politics and continue your repeated philosophy that government and business must be both respectful and responsible, each to the other, in order to provide Ontarians with an appropriate quality of life."

I want to assure the member for Wilson Heights, for whom I have a very high regard, and he knows that; I want to assure all the readers of the Wall Street Journal, for whom I have an equally high regard, that this government is determined to be fair, it is determined to be responsible and it is determined to act on behalf of all the citizens of the province.

I can also tell the member for Wilson Heights that we do not intend to be intimidated by anyone, no matter how powerful or well-connected they may be.

TRANSFER PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Treasurer having to do with his announcement on transfer payments, which are usually made about this time of the year. I think the Treasurer and others would be aware that the decision made on the level of these transfer payments amounts to about 40% of the overall budget. When that commitment is made, some of his colleagues might feel their hands are somewhat tied when it comes to the allocation of the little bit that remains. The fact remains that school boards and municipalities have budgetary years beginning 1 January. Of course, the hospitals and universities are extremely interested in what level of support they are going to get. Their expectations, as the Treasurer knows, are very high indeed.

Can the minister say if he is going to be able to make this information available in the near future, particularly before he leaves to meet with his colleagues in Winnipeg?

Hon Mr Laughren: It is not my intention to make the announcement before we meet in Winnipeg later this week. I appreciate the fact that the municipalities and the school boards like to have that information as soon as possible. I think the leader would appreciate the fact that because there were several months taken out of the process this year because of an election, the transition period and a new government, we will not be able to make the announcement as soon as we would have liked.

Mr Phillips: My supplementary is regarding nurses, and I think the answer will be extremely important to nurses. As the Treasurer knows, contract negotiations begin. In all likelihood, the Ontario Nurses' Association, if previous patterns exist, will settle a contract that will run into 1994. I think the Treasurer also knows that expectations among the nurses are quite high. I think the Premier himself was recently at a convention of the nurses, reassuring them about salary promises and commitments.

The Treasurer also knows there is only one source of funds to reach an agreement with the nurses, that is, the grants the Treasurer will provide to the hospitals, and that

the major item in the hospital budget is indeed nurses' salaries.

Can the Treasurer assure the nurses of the province that as he puts together these grants and announces them over the next few weeks, the grants to the hospitals will clearly reflect his government's commitment to the nurses of the province?

Hon Mr Laughren: Living with high expectations is something to which we are becoming accustomed. I must say that we are very much aware of the historical problems with the pay of nurses. We are also very much aware of the demands of the Ontario Hospital Association for grants that will be forthcoming in the new year. They will be taken into consideration along with everyone else's demands when we make the major transfer announcements.

Mr Beer: The Treasurer would know that school boards right now are anxiously awaiting some information in terms of how much they are going to be receiving, and the Treasurer will recall that in *An Agenda for Reform* a number of commitments were made by the new government. Recently, in one of the Toronto papers, it was noted that the Minister of Education had said that the Metropolitan Toronto Public School Board could be looking at something in the order of 20% support from the province. As the Treasurer knows, that 20% would be something in the order of \$400 million.

Does the Treasurer recognize that in order to meet that commitment and to provide the other 176 school boards in the province with even a mere inflationary 5% increase, which would be around \$250 million, that would mean overall at least a 15% increase in the grants to the school boards? Is the Treasurer prepared today to tell us that he is going to keep that commitment to Metropolitan Toronto and provide to the other school boards at the very least a 5% increase?

Hon Mr Laughren: I do not want to get into the situation in a piecemeal kind of way announcing what the transfer announcements will be. However, members all know that we are in the midst of a recession, they all know we are going to have a substantial deficit in 1990-91 of \$2.5 billion, they all know we are not going to be climbing out of this recession until the latter part of 1991. Those same members who expressed dismay in the debate last week about the size of the deficit, even at \$2.5 billion, I am sure would want to be consistent as they look down the road about the kind of commitments we are able to make to other levels in this province.

I hope members opposite will appreciate the fact that we are in a difficult economic time and that we must manage our expenditures as prudently as is possible, given the fact that tax revenues have been declining for the last half of this year.

RENT REVIEW

Mr Tilson: I have a question for the Minister of Housing. We have been listening over the weekend to some of his rather controversial statements, and I will say that the minister's ham-handed approach to rent control is causing untold hardship not only to apartment owners, which he

expected and indeed seemed to look forward to, but also to the trades and suppliers who renovate and fixture those apartments. For example, Regal Aluminum Railings of Concord laid off 108 workers after \$5 million in orders were cancelled. Wind-o-Mart Ltd has lost \$2 million in orders, and that amount may rise to \$5 million. Mercury Electric Products may lose \$1.5 million or one quarter of its business. All of these examples were reported in the press over the weekend.

Is the minister prepared to admit that the implications of his actions go far beyond simple tenant protection and are right now resulting in job losses and economic hardship for an entire sector in the economy already reeling from the effects of the recession?

1410

Hon Mr Cooke: What I would indicate to the member is that somehow in the last several days the whole argument has failed to recognize that under our legislation tenants have not been given permission to stop paying rent. They are still paying their monthly rent—hundreds of dollars of monthly rent.

I think it would be very unreasonable and irresponsible for the member to advocate that landlords are able to stop maintenance and repairs just because we have brought in a bill to offer tenant protection. That is not what we proposed. There is legislation in this province to call for the maintenance of buildings, and I am sure the member would agree with me that landlords are expected to meet those pieces of legislation and maintain standards in their buildings across Ontario.

Mr Tilson: I think what we are seeing here is Rambo VI. As the minister has apparently adopted a Rambo-like approach to the issue of landlords maintaining their properties no matter what, would he tell this House what sort of bloated bureaucracy will be required in both rental standards boards and municipal property standards departments to enforce his determination to see landlords maintain their buildings?

Hon Mr Cooke: I think one of the difficulties that all of us have had under the current rent review legislation is that it has been so complex that it has cost the taxpayers of this province \$40 million a year to administer an incredibly complex system.

I think one of the prime goals of this government is to develop with landlords and with tenants, over as short a period of time as possible, a system of rent regulation which will be simpler and clearer to both landlords and tenants and which will result, in fact, in some of the bureaucracy in the rent review system being able to be downsized so that we will have a simpler system. So I would expect a member of the Conservative Party who is very concerned about the size of government to be supporting a process that will result in simpler legislation that tenants and landlords will be able to use.

Mr Tilson: There is no question, I think, that we all agree there is absolute panic in the housing economy. If the minister feels that the situation is so complex, and given the controversy over his proposed legislation, is he prepared to give this House an undertaking that it will be

referred to committee for a full public discussion and debate?

Hon Mr Cooke: What I certainly hope we would be able to accomplish together is that the temporary legislation will be put in place as quickly as possible so that we can proceed with the process of consultation. I fully expect that this issue would be discussed by a committee. But what I would say to the member is that if we are to shorten that period—the two-year moratorium, which I have indicated to landlords I would like to do; I want the new and permanent system to be in place as quickly as possible—then we need to get on with the process of passing the temporary legislation and refer out to committee the long-term ideas we have so that they can be discussed with landlords and tenants and we can get on with developing permanent legislation. I think that would be the appropriate way to proceed.

Mr Harris: My question is to the Minister of Housing. I just want to clearly understand a couple of things. One, he is calling this temporary legislation. Every temporary legislation I have ever seen brought in has not been temporary. Rent controls in 1975, condominium conversion controls brought in, they were all temporary. Would the minister agree with me that his temporary legislation over the next period of two years will devalue the private sector rental stock in this province by about \$20 billion, retroactive to 1 October, immediately?

Hon Mr Cooke: The first thing I want to make very clear to the House is that this is temporary legislation. This will be legislation that we want to replace with simpler, long-term rent control legislation. We have always taken the position that rent regulation is something that has to be permanent in Ontario and I continue to believe this. But I agree, the moratorium that we have introduced is not the right legislation for Ontario on a permanent basis. It is there to stabilize the market now, while we can work with the opposition, landlords and tenants across the province to develop a long-term, workable system, and that is exactly what I would like to do.

Mr Harris: Given that it was the Premier's intention before and during the election and his stated philosophy that it was his goal to bring in legislation that would substantially devalue the amount of private sector rental property in this province, given that the minister's legislation does that by \$20 billion worth of devaluation that is in there—I have not heard him dispute that figure—is the minister really trying to tell this House that he thinks we should pass this on a wink and a nod, without any consultation, without public hearings?

This party of openness and consultation, this party that year after year said, "You must consult with people before you make any changes"—will the minister commit today that Bill 4, this legislation that retroactively takes away \$20 billion worth of value from the rental property stock in this province, will in fact go out for full public hearings before he brings it in as legislation?

Hon Mr Cooke: First of all, I would like to say to the leader of the third party that he can choose, if he wishes, to buy those types of statistics that are being thrown out by

radical groups like the Association For Furthering Ontario's Rental Development. But if he wants to buy those kinds of figures, then I think we are going to have difficulty having a real understanding of the difficulties the tenants experience in the system as well.

The \$20 billion figure has just been pulled out of the air by a landlords' group. But I would say to the leader of the third party that if real estate values have gone down in Ontario, it is not because of Bill 4; it is because of his party's federal government and the high interest rate policy. That is very clear.

I finish by saying, as a person who was House leader for the official opposition, if the Conservatives, as an opposition party, and the Liberals, want this bill to go out to committee for public hearings—I would prefer that we go with the long-term alternatives; but if the leader wants this bill out to committee, I understand the rules and of course the bill will go out to committee for public hearings. We are not going to ram something down his throat or anybody else's.

Mr Harris: I appreciate the minister's saying he knows the rules of the House. What I find shocking is that his party did not want this piece of legislation to go out, that he did not want the benefit of the public input, that the New Democrats were a party that was going to say: "We'll pass the legislation. We'll zip-a-dee-doo it right in." He said it at the House leaders' meeting last Thursday, when his House leader said, "We'd like this passed before Christmas and then we'll have hearings to consult." The government told the industry that. It has told everybody that: Unless this bill is passed before Christmas, it is somebody else's fault.

I do not mind being the somebody else. It is my fault and I insist that this bill go out for full hearings and consultation. I am shocked that the Minister of Housing and the Premier, since the two of them are consulting on this, think that this type of legislation should just be passed in place, and then they will consult after the fact.

Hon Mr Cooke: I would say to the leader of the third party that he should just calm down. This is only the third week that the House has been back in session.

Mr Mahoney: You sound a little arrogant over there.

Mrs Cunningham: That's not like you.

Hon Mr Cooke: I am just suggesting that he should calm down. At a discussion last week in the House leaders' meeting, we indicated how we would like to proceed, but we indicated all along that there would be public hearings on the issue of rent regulation during the break. So if the leader of the third party has a suggestion to put forward, which he obviously does, I suggest that the House leaders will discuss it, the House leaders will schedule it, and everybody will be happy with the process.

1420

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Chiarelli: My question is for the Premier. On 10 November, on the subject of public auto insurance, he said: "The approach the government takes has to be based not just on pie-in-the-sky hope, but a solidly based, docu-

mented approach. The decision can't be made on ideology. It has to be based on facts."

On 1 November the Premier and his minister were given copies of a comprehensive economic analysis prepared by DRI McGraw Hill Canada showing possible losses of 23,000 jobs in Ontario as a result of his government's plan. Yet on 24 November, some three and a half weeks later, his minister told Robert Fisher on Focus Ontario: "There has been no suggestion to me by any of the industry as to who and what and when there would be any job loss."

My question to the Premier is, since his minister does not know what economic studies are being provided to him, can he tell us if the government has commissioned any internal or outside studies to determine the economic impacts of public automobile insurance in Ontario?

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the question, and I can tell the member that obviously the minister and others are looking at, as we have already said, the plans that are in place in a number of provinces. Obviously we are looking at a question of the structure of the industry in this province and we are looking at the question of exactly what kind of proposal makes the most sense for Ontario's drivers and for the Ontario public. That is the approach we are taking; that is the approach we are going to continue to take.

The minister, as I understand it, has already offered to meet with the people who commissioned the particular study, a study commissioned by the industry. Of course, there are going to be a number of studies out there, but I can assure the member that this is being looked at in a very careful and dispassionate way.

Again, I want to stress, as I stressed in an earlier answer to other members, that we intend to consult, to listen to people, and then we intend to act as clearly as we can in the public interest, because we think that is why we were elected.

Mr Chiarelli: Obviously the minister is either incompetent or misleading the public. For three weeks he was sitting with the report on his desk and yet he is telling the public of Ontario, through the televised media, that he has no such information.

Perhaps it ties in with what the parliamentary assistant to the minister said last Thursday, when he revealed that the government is conducting its meetings secretly so as not to "tip its hat to the insurance industry."

According to the Globe and Mail today, it would appear that the government is not carrying out any economic assessment of its own. The DRI analysis goes on to say that in addition to the 23,000 lost jobs, the NDP's nationalization scheme would create a \$2.6-billion capital outflow from the province and increase the provincial debt by \$3.9 billion over four years. Does the Premier have any economic analysis which refutes the DRI predictions, and if so, when will he make such information available to this House?

Hon Mr Rae: To put it mildly, the story that I, along with a number of other people, read in the Globe today and the study which has been made are, if I can be polite,

entirely speculative, purely hypothetical and totally one-dimensional.

Mr Chiarelli: What are you going to do to refute it?

Hon Mr Rae: Just for the benefit of those who are watching and who did not hear the comment, the member then shouts out, "What are you going to do to refute it?" All I can say to the member is, our approach as a government is going to be to listen to and learn from all those who are saying various things.

Mr Chiarelli: It's a secret? Doing it in secret.

Hon Mr Rae: The member is now shouting out, "Meetings will be held in secret." The members may have seen us. There was an oath ceremony in which we were required—cabinet committees are required to discuss these things in confidence. That is absolutely right. That is the way the cabinet works.

There will be a number of other discussions with the industry which, I can assure the member, will be held and all that information will come out. A bill will be presented to the House, a bill will be debated in the House. If I have any sense of life, that debate will be a very lively and full one. I am under no illusions about that. The bill will then be referred to a committee. The committee will be asked to travel. There will be all and every opportunity for the insurance industry to present its views when that bill goes to a committee. Then the committee will make a decision, and it will come back to this House for a third reading.

There will be a full and open discussion, and that discussion will lead to the protection of public interest in the province of Ontario.

Mr Scott: You're not speaking at his nomination meeting. You can sit down now.

The Speaker: I, like other members, appreciate the occasional refresher on procedure. To the member for St. George-St. David, I also appreciate the long-held tradition of referring to members by their riding or position.

NON-PROFIT HOUSING

Mr Turnbull: My question is for the Minister of Housing. On 27 November 1990, the Ministry of Housing announced that the government will fund a co-operative in Scarborough with 79 units. The annual operating subsidy for the 58 rent-geared-to-income units will be approximately \$2 million. This subsidy amounts to \$2,663 per apartment per month. If this money were to be given outright, it would allow each of the 58 families to purchase a \$245,000 home. And look, for the bargain price of \$135,000 they could buy condominiums. How can the minister justify this outrageous use of money?

Hon Mr Cooke: Before we came in this morning, I had a brief meeting with my staff to discuss this matter, but the member should understand, and I am sure he does, that a co-op house or apartment that is built in Toronto is very costly to build. The fact of the matter is that the mortgages, as he knows, are paid off over a 35-year period. I am advised that the figures that are used, and the figures that were used in the newspaper today, are the guesstimates by the sponsoring group at the time the unit is committed. The ministry has indicated to me that it will

be nowhere near that much money on a monthly basis for subsidy.

Mr Harris: The Minister of Housing, with his announcement of last week, has clearly stated unequivocally, he and the Premier, that the private sector is no longer welcome in the rental housing business, either existing or future, in the province of Ontario. Second, he has talked about replacing the private sector with non-profit housing.

Let me give him two projects that are his figures. This is the ministry release, the ribbon has already been cut, they are open, they are up and running. Jacksons Point, northwest of Aurora: This one opened this summer. The subsidy by government is in excess of \$1,000 a month. That is the government subsidy for this non-profit housing. The second one, in Keswick: This one is about \$1,100 or more a month subsidization to put this non-profit housing on stream. This is the type of housing that the minister wants to replace.

The average private sector apartment rent in this province is less than \$700 a month. He wants to drive that out of the province. He is saying that is unacceptable, no more private sector, because his philosophy is, "We don't care whether it costs the taxpayers billions of dollars more; non-profit, by golly, it is and private sector out of this province."

How can the minister justify project after project after project costing the taxpayers billions of dollars in excess of the private sector units that he says are ripping us off already? How can he justify replacing them on the basis of an outdated socialist philosophy?

1430

Hon Mr Cooke: I am sure the leader of the third party knows that there are two programs in Ontario to put non-profit housing on the market. One of them is the provincial Homes Now program, and the other one is the federal-provincial program in which his federal government participates, and we are very grateful that it does, on exactly the same basis as the Homes Now program.

The member is using an average rent of \$600 or \$700 and comparing that with the rent it requires to have a non-profit or co-op housing unit break even in 1990; that is absolutely silly. He is comparing apples with oranges. The fact of the matter is that if we were simply to go out and rent private sector markets and try in that way to meet the housing need—the vacancy rate in Toronto is 1%; the vacancy rate in Ottawa is 0.3%—we would be no further ahead of the game. The goal of this government, the goal of the former government, the goal to some extent of the federal government with the federal and provincial program, is to add supply, to get more supply of affordable housing. That is a philosophy that I very much support and I think the vast majority of people in this province support that as well.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT CORP CONTRACT

Mr Martin: My question is to the Minister of Transportation. We have heard a lot about northern Ontario earlier this afternoon and everybody knows, especially those of us who live up there, that things are not very good

at this moment. However, I believe some good news was announced this weekend with respect to that part of the province. Could the minister elaborate for us on the Urban Transportation Development Corp contract signed through Can-Car in Thunder Bay for \$50 million worth of technology to Los Angeles?

Hon Mr Philip: I can confirm that UTDC has won a \$51.4-million contract for 40 bilevel commuter rail cars for the Los Angeles County Transit Commission. The cars are to be delivered by August 1992. This represents some 400 job-years for the people of Thunder Bay. There is also an option for an additional 60 cars within six months—20 for San Diego and 40 for Los Angeles.

Mr Elston: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know that people here are relatively new and that we are just getting ourselves into the regular conduct of business and I know that the impact of this particular agreement is important to the province. This really ought to have been the subject matter of a minister's statement. It really ought to have been provided for us so that we could have made comment on it rather than conducting it in this way. Those people in opposition would have skewered us had we done it. I think that they should treat us with respect in this regard and have a statement.

Mr Scott: If you rule this out, I'm not coming to your room for dinner tomorrow.

The Speaker: I am not sure you are invited.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I assume that since the member quite properly raised a point of order he would like a response. I will respond when I am allowed to. I am inclined to agree with the member for Bruce. I was listening quite closely. It did indeed sound like the subject material for a minister's statement. I will review the Hansard for today and would ask that if the minister could wrap up his remarks within a few seconds without a supplementary, that is fine. Then we will move on with the regular rotation for questions.

Mr Elston: On that point of order, Mr Speaker: Might I ask, since the clock has run continuously since since that time, that we add some more time on, please?

The Speaker: I hasten to add that a large part of the clock running was due to extraneous information from other members.

Minister, do you have any more remarks to make? If not, we will continue in rotation.

DAY CARE

Mrs McLeod: My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. The minister has indicated publicly that child care is a high priority for her government. In the New Democratic Party's Agenda for People, a very specific commitment was made to provide 10,000 new non-profit day care spaces and 10,000 new subsidies in each of the first and second years of an NDP government. They said they would do it and they said what it would cost, \$240 million in total. That is much clearer than the very non-explicit statement in the throne speech that day care would be extended.

May I ask the minister, will she provide 10,000 new day care spaces and 10,000 new subsidies in this, the first

May I ask the minister, will she provide 10,000 new day care spaces and 10,000 new subsidies in this, the first year of an NDP government, or was that simply a promise made when no one thought it would have to be delivered?

Hon Mrs Akande: I thank the member for the question. I and this government are indeed committed to extending the services and the provision of spaces in day care. We realize the tremendous significance this has to families and more specifically to women in this province, and therefore it is a commitment which we have made and will continue to make. However, we are confronted, as the member will know, with limitations in budget, limitations which seriously curtail the kinds of things that we want to do and that we planned to do.

In spite of that, we are waiting for our study of the budget and we will, of course, comply with some of those promises and make that information available in this House.

Mrs McLeod: I noted a little bit earlier the Treasurer's rather offhanded comment that they are getting used to living with high expectations, but I would respectfully suggest that this government did a great deal to create those expectations which they are now trying so hard to dampen.

In this case, the Coalition for Better Child Care made it quite clear on 8 November that it expected the new government to keep this particular promise. They felt they were asking for no more as an immediate step than what An Agenda for People stated this government was committed to provide.

The minister's leader knew when that promise was made that the federal government had capped the Canada assistance plan, and he knew that there was a developing recession. He still made the commitment. Day care advocates, I think, have a reason to feel angry and concerned that there was no indication in the throne speech of what this government's commitment would now be. May I ask the minister whether we can now expect that the NDP government's commitment to day care will resemble the 2% solution to the food bank crisis?

How long will the minister keep people waiting for the assurance that her government is as good as its word?

Hon Mrs Akande: I thank the member once again for the question. I know the member will realize that of course these things do take time and that every promise is not written in the throne speech. It is not intended to be an indication of the only things that we will do. We will, of course, respond to the needs in day care. We have always supported that issue and we will continue to support it. We will make that announcement when we have done that very quickly in this House.

1440

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Jackson: My question is to the Premier. It is with respect to the Premier's summer Agenda for People campaign in which he clearly stated, and I would like to quote from it, "We would increase social assistance rates to ensure that social assistance provides a real safety net for

those who must rely on it" to a cost of approximately \$300 million per year.

As if to confirm this public expectation that he would make good on this election promise, the Premier went on in the throne speech to say, "We pledge to continue the reform of Ontario's social assistance system and address the shame of child poverty...."

The people in whose name the Premier's election agenda was styled, especially the 100,000 people who rely on food banks every month in Metropolitan Toronto and those who make up approximately the 70% increase in welfare case loads in this province, supported the Premier in the last election and they feel disenchanted by the minister's announcement last Thursday of less than a third of what the Premier promised in August to alleviate their poverty.

Was the Premier's Agenda for People in reality an agenda for election victory? But more important, why has he maligned his own social conscience on this issue?

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the question from the member for Burlington South and would say to him and to the public of Ontario that I think the public of Ontario understands that the government was elected on 6 September, that we took office on 1 October, that we have made a number of announcements since the throne speech clearly indicating the direction of our policy and indicating that within our means we are going to do what we can. I think they also understand that other major financial announcements are going to have to wait for the budget, which will come in the spring.

I also want to say as clearly as I can that we are committed to changing the direction and the policies of this province with respect to the poverty issue. I think the groups out there with whom the minister has been meeting, with whom I have been meeting, with whom our ministers have been meeting, understand that we are going to do what we can, that some of it is going to take longer than other things.

We announced just last week an expenditure of over \$100 million on an annualized basis with respect to welfare payments. I would say to the member that I think that represents a very clear signal to those communities and to the people of this province that we are going to do what we can and that we are going to live up to the commitments that we have made to the people of this province.

Mr Jackson: With all due respect, that is not what the Premier was saying three months ago. That is not what he was saying particularly to councils all across Ontario which are running huge deficits as a result of the phenomenal increase in the demand for social assistance funding. I remind the Premier that the deficits for these municipalities run counter to the laws of this province as set out under the Municipal Act. It is illegal for these deficits to go unchecked. It is in that context that councils are expressing concern about his first election promise—that he would address it.

But he also made additional promises. He went on record as saying that the provincial government should pick up the shortfall in these deficits for 1990. He was quoted in the *Toronto Star*, and I would like to read the

quote directly from the Toronto Star, "My party's position is that any transfer of responsibility for providing services from provincial to municipal level must be accompanied by the necessary funding to pay for these services." The article goes on to say that some \$59 million is the expected shortfall in the Metropolitan Toronto area. The article also says they were relying for payment on a promise the Premier and Metro-area NDP candidates made days before the election. These are written responses from the Premier and from all but one NDP member from Metro that greatly enhanced their electoral chances going into the last week of the election.

Again I ask him, has he betrayed his own social conscience and his written statements to Metro council with this promise?

Hon Mr Rae: Again, I appreciate the supplementary. I must confess to being a little perplexed by the member's second question, only in this sense: His first question was, "You haven't done anything." His second question was, "You've done something, and what are the consequences for the municipalities?" The member cannot quite have it both ways. If he wants to have it both ways, that is fine, but I do not think he can.

Let me answer as clearly as I can to the member. When the Minister of Community and Social Services made the announcement with respect to welfare increases this year, to my recollection in this House—and I have been here for a few years now—this is the first occasion on which a minister of the crown has indicated that there will be direct relief for the municipalities as a result of our decision to increase welfare payments, the first time it has been done in my recollection, the very first time. I do not recall the member's party doing it when it was in government for 42 years. I do not recall the Liberals doing it when they were in office for five years.

The municipalities of this province know we are entering into an intensive discussion with them with respect to the question of the administration of welfare, with respect to the question of taxation and how we share it. It is going to be a very important discussion for the future of the province. The member has raised his voice and said, "How can they trust us?" The municipalities will trust us because we are the first government in history that has carried out that kind of initiative.

Mr Elston: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I do not mind the honourable member for York South going on at length, but he has been doing that now for the last several days. Again, I know we are all new here, but he tends to think he is making speeches again, and that is not what the key to the success of this question period is. I would ask again that you examine the Hansard transcript and provide us with some time to have more questions asked in this House.

The Speaker: Actually, I appreciate what you have raised because the Speaker not only listened to the question and the answer but watched the clock. The placing of the supplementary, which normally follows simply from the answer previously given, took more than a minute and a half to place. So, when members choose to be wordy

with respect to the questions they ask, they perhaps are asking for wordy responses. I suppose if all members are mindful that we have 60 minutes, and if members wish to have that time available mostly for backbench members to ask questions, then all of us are going to have to be guarded about how we place questions and how we respond to them. It applies all the way around the House.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr Owens: My question is for the Minister of Labour. According to published reports, the Ministry of Labour ordered the Port Colborne fire department not to respond to water rescue calls until such time as they are trained and properly equipped. Apparently this arises out of a situation where a Port Colborne firefighter, Harry Chevalier, drowned while he was attempting to rescue two swimmers. The two swimmers also died. What does the minister know of this order and did he have any personal involvement in this issue?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I want to thank the member for raising the question. I want to inform him and this House that the media report is not true at all, that my ministry has issued no such order to the Port Colborne fire department or to any fire department in this province. What has happened is that the ministry officials investigated the accident, since it was an on-the-job accident, and orders were issued to the Port Colborne fire department to assure proper training for water rescue so that this unfortunate tragedy would not happen again. But we have never told nor would we ever tell any public safety organization not to respond to the need for emergency rescue. I think that would be unthinkable. We must take every possible precaution to protect the lives of rescue workers, but public safety must come first in this province.

1450

Mr Scott: Now you get up and read your bit and then he answers it. Now you ask your bit. You read the bit on the piece of paper there. Read it out loud as you can and directly to the Speaker. Now here it comes.

Mr Owens: With respect to the opposition, this government did spend a lot of money educating me and I take the opportunity to express the pleasure that I am able to read and write.

I would like to thank the minister for clearing up the inaccurate report. I would like to know what steps his ministry is taking other than issuing orders to train the firefighters to respond appropriately to these calls, both appropriately and safely.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: First of all, as a result of the ministry investigation into this tragedy, a hazard alert is being issued and developed for use by fire departments right across the province of Ontario. Second, there has been an inquest into the drownings and we are awaiting the recommendations of the jury. My ministry will be studying those recommendations carefully to see if there is anything else that can be done to handle this matter.

As I said before, we are vitally concerned with the health and safety of all workers, including public safety workers who are often at extreme risk, but as well we must

also bear in mind that public safety is paramount. Training and proper equipment will give public safety workers even more confidence during rescue attempts and ultimately, hopefully, save more lives in the province of Ontario.

OAK RIDGES MORaine

Mrs Caplan: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I believe he is here in the chamber. Last Thursday the minister stated his government's intention to continue the policy of protecting the Oak Ridges moraine under the provincial interest that was declared by the previous government. The minister may be aware that Keele Valley landfill in Maple falls within the moraine.

In light of the Minister of the Environment's stated intent to use her emergency powers to expand this landfill, will the Minister of Municipal Affairs today give his commitment to use his powers to protect the moraine and to ensure a full environmental assessment of any proposed expansion?

Hon Mr Cooke: I was trying to get an indication from the Minister of the Environment whether she would, but what I would indicate to the member very clearly is that this government and the Minister of the Environment, who is the minister responsible for the greater Toronto area, and myself will be working as closely as we can, as a government, to provide the proper services in this community and for the region for the disposal of their garbage and also at the same time protect the environment.

I think the strategy that the Minister of the Environment has outlined to this House and to the people of Ontario in terms of the 3Rs is the appropriate strategy. If we can all work together and have good tough regulations to reduce garbage, then a lot of these very uncomfortable and undesirable alternatives will not have to be implemented.

Mrs Caplan: I would say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that a provincial interest has been declared. He clearly stated the intention of that policy to continue. He has his obligations, and I would say to him that the operation of the Keele Valley landfill is subject to a provincial certificate of approval and contracts between Metropolitan Toronto, the region of York and the town of Vaughan, and that in 1983 an agreement established terms and conditions for the operations and indicates that any change in volume, capacity and contours of the site would require the input and the approval of the municipality of Vaughan. An emergency order by the Minister of the Environment would remove those rights.

The mayor of Vaughan is meeting with the Minister of the Environment today. She will be stating Vaughan's position that no expansion should occur without a full environmental assessment. Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs today state very clearly that he will take the steps necessary to uphold the municipalities' contract rights and protect the Oak Ridges moraine, as is his responsibility.

Hon Mr Cooke: What I can commit myself to doing is what I said in response to the member's first question: working very closely with the minister responsible for the GTA and the environment to make sure that we develop together a plan to deal with the garbage from the greater

Toronto area. I think that after eight weeks in government that is all the member can expect.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

CITY OF LONDON ACT, 1990

Mrs Cunningham moved first reading of Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the City of London.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1990

Ms Churley moved first reading of Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

DÉBATS SUR LE DISCOURS DU TRÔNE

(suite)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr Chiarelli: Last Thursday, when I adjourned the debate, I was just getting ready to wrap up my remarks. I was talking about the reality that Ottawa-Carleton is the only urban area in Canada that does not have any long-term care psychiatric beds. I was referring to the erroneous information which the ministry had been providing to the various ministers over the years. I just want to conclude on that.

One of the responses that the ministry had indicated was, first of all, that the Royal Ottawa Hospital was not referring sufficient patients to the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital, some 90 miles away. Of course, the Royal Ottawa Hospital provided information that out of many referrals, a lot of referrals were not accepted by the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital.

Last January I delivered a memo to the deputy minister, Dr Martin Barkin. I think the members of the House will want to know that I think that is where the problem lies. I believe the deputy minister has been ignoring the facts about Ottawa-Carleton. I believe that he should start setting the minister straight on the realities of Ottawa-Carleton on this particular issue.

I want to address some remarks to the minister, who is now from Ottawa-Carleton. We have noted that with much fanfare she has talked about providing access to people who require abortions in Ontario. While that may be very laudable in her opinion or in the opinion of her government or a lot of people, I will say that she should look in her own backyard at what happens to psychiatric patients requiring long-term care.

In Ottawa-Carleton, in her own backyard, the Royal Ottawa Hospital must hospitalize these patients some 90 miles away, almost as far as Montreal. If the minister is interested in access to hospital services, I think she should look at the mentally ill people requiring hospitalization in

Ottawa-Carleton. I would say to Dr Martin Barkin, would you please properly inform the minister so she can make the proper decisions?

There is an obligation on the part of this government to deal fairly. In this particular instance, there is a very large crack through which a lot of patients are falling. One can well imagine people in Metropolitan Toronto having to have their mentally ill family hospitalized in Trenton to the east or in Woodstock to the west. It is unacceptable for Metropolitan Toronto; it should be unacceptable for Ottawa-Carleton. I will be constantly and consistently urging the Minister of Health to look after her own backyard and fill that crack in the system.

1500

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, my apologies to the House—there was an agreement among the three House leaders to divide the time this afternoon and I would ask the Clerk to keep the time for the debate.

Mr Harnick: Mr Speaker, may I thank you for permitting me to have this opportunity to reply to the speech from the throne on behalf of the people of Willowdale. In the past this riding, actually created in 1987 by amalgamating portions of the then York Mills and Armourdale ridings, was represented by Gordon Carton, Bruce McCaffrey and Dr Bette Stephenson, all ministers of the crown who represented their constituents with the greatest distinction. The first actual sitting member of this riding in 1987 was Gino Matrondola, who represented Willowdale with all his heart. I hope that I will follow in the tradition that has been set by my most worthy predecessors.

Mr Speaker, may I also congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker, and I would also like to say that it was an honour to take part in the election of the first Speaker by that method.

My constituents had to say the least mixed emotions about the speech from the throne and the perceived direction they see this new government about to take—after the freezes and the moratoriums are completed.

They are clearly disappointed with the sudden uncertainty of the government with regard to its positions on rent control, automobile insurance, the environment, small business and taxation. Suddenly what was so straightforward and clear has become convoluted and murky. An Agenda for People, believed in by 37% of the electorate on 6 September, seems no longer to be the order of the day.

My constituents are also expressing concern over those items not discussed in the speech from the throne, where there was no mention of health care, a major concern to seniors in Willowdale, and education, both pre- and post-secondary schools, a major concern to the young people in my riding.

There was also no mention of help for small business, the area where jobs must really be created. I was dismayed last week when the Premier said to my leader that he should not be so gloomy when watching bankruptcies increase in this province. The loss of these small business entrepreneurs who create wealth, because they are prepared to take risks and thus create jobs, is of great concern to the people of Willowdale.

Our young people received no commitments in the speech from the throne, and this causes me concern. Where is the commitment for 60% funding of public schools? The Brébeuf Secondary School in my riding was built for an enrolment of 300 students. Today there are over 1,100 students, and 60% are in portables. Is this the 60% the government was talking about? Where is the commitment to capital spending in our schools?

Taxation was the major issue in the election held just three months ago. People cannot afford to pay more taxes, yet it appears this government, despite its avowed policy against market value assessment, is going ahead with a \$20-million expenditure for property reassessment. It is embarking down a road where there will be no return despite its firm and enunciated policy dating back to 1984 which rejected market value reassessment.

Seniors in Willowdale are concerned. They worry for their safety in the streets. What is this government's policy? They worry about their health care. They see hospital beds being closed. Will there be a bed available to them if they should take sick or will they remain in a hospital corridor or be sent to a hospital far from home to be cared for?

What has happened to a driver-owned auto insurance plan where all of my constituents would receive good value for the premium dollar while retaining the right to claim for the actual injuries and losses which they suffer in the event of injury in a motor vehicle accident? On 6 September this plan was so near. Today it is so far away—when people being injured daily learn they have no recourse. Why the delay? Slater has studied the issue, then Osborne, then Kruger, then a legislative committee. Now people who are injured in accidents have nowhere to turn. Why the delay?

I must state as well that my constituents are cautiously optimistic regarding the Sheppard subway. I say cautiously because the previous government made a loose commitment to the subway but no action was ever taken, this despite the fact that private funding was available to contribute to the cost. This private funding is still available. This funding will also provide housing, a large component of such housing being of the affordable nature. In recessionary times the construction of a subway and of housing will also create jobs.

Furthermore, in addition to the completion of the subway and the affordable housing being built, this project will have a positive effect on the environment. We all know that automobiles are responsible for over half of all airborne pollution, while adding to the greenhouse effect, acid rain and a high level of energy consumption.

The mayor of North York states that the subway is ready to go. He is only waiting for the Premier to give the word.

Finally, the Sheppard subway's construction and the building of new housing will rejuvenate neighbourhoods now awaiting renovation. These neighbourhoods are occupied by transient tenants. Rates of crime are increasing and home owners living in neighbourhoods along the Sheppard corridor have lost the quiet enjoyment of their homes.

My constituents are not greedy people. They do not want all of the government's \$700 million for their infrastructure needs. They just want a portion. Willowdale is in the heart of the greater Toronto area where concerns about public transportation, housing and the environment are paramount. On behalf of my constituents, may I say we do not want to be denied for too much longer.

Finally, I am becoming concerned at this government's early propensity to avoid coming up with solutions to today's problems by blaming others and by passing the buck. This was a favourite approach of the Liberals. People obviously expected better. They expected a constructive approach. It is not enough to say one is against something without offering an alternative.

Let me tell my friends on the other side of this House that the people of Willowdale expect decisive action. They had all the answers before the election. Future study, moratoriums, freezes and blaming others will not create a province of excellence. It will only mire us in mediocrity.

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, in order that all three parties have the same amount of time, I would ask for unanimous consent to waive the questions and comments period for today.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that we waive questions and comments?

Agreed to.

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: I am honoured to be taking part in this debate on the first throne speech of the New Democratic Party government. I am especially gratified to represent the constituency of Port Arthur. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the constituents of Port Arthur and reiterate my promise to listen to them and be their voice at Queen's Park. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Premier for the confidence he has placed in me by appointing me to the Minister of Revenue portfolio.

I would now like to inform the people in this Legislature what the throne speech means to me, to the people of Port Arthur and the people of Ontario. This throne speech is realistic, concrete and measurable. We believe, as the government, that we have to gain the people's trust. The day we were elected was the beginning of that relationship. We did not want to destroy that relationship by making promises in the throne speech that were not realistic. People in this province want change and not empty rhetoric. People in this province want to be a part of change and not be forced to change.

1510

Before I was elected, I served as an employee of the social services department in the city of Thunder Bay. There I learned that individuals want to contribute and to participate productively. As a government, we will encourage productive participation by all the people of this province. We will break down the barriers that prevent this from happening. We will extend child care, reform the social assistance program, address child poverty, deal effectively with violence against women and children, improve support and custody order enforcement, provide a common pause day, protect small business and the rights

of workers, increase the minimum wage and improve health and social services.

By recognizing the needs of all Ontarians and not just those who shout the loudest, we will all benefit, and An Agenda for People will happen.

During the election I toured the Faye Peterson Transition House, which was also visited by the former Minister of Community and Social Services. It serves as a refuge for women and children who have fled their homes and communities in northwestern Ontario. What I saw there was deplorable.

In this agency, which serves northwestern Ontario, were 15 beds in four rooms. Some of these beds were bunk-beds, where families had to go when they wanted safety. Sometimes when they arrived they were forced to go back to their homes because there was no room left.

The playground in the backyard was a trodden-down area with no grass left. In the basement, in the corner of the playroom was a sleeping bag on the cement floor. When I asked who slept there, the staff replied: "A teenage boy goes there at night for privacy."

I asked myself why this was allowed to happen to our women and children. Do they not deserve more?

Our government has promised those people that the corridors of power in Ontario are open to them as never before. They will see change and be a part of change, and I think we had a great example of that on 1 October, the evening we opened the doors of Queen's Park to the public of Ontario and had a variety of groups there who could enjoy Queen's Park.

Women, who have always been underrepresented in government, are now an integral part of the decision-making team. This government has great representation from the north: Six cabinet ministers and four other valuable northern MPPs.

The government is committed to a program to ensure that society as a whole is fairer. In my own responsibilities as Minister of Revenue, I will be proud to take the results of our Fair Tax Commission and implement real changes to restore public confidence in the integrity of our tax system.

Right after the throne speech, I had the honour to introduce this government's first piece of legislation, Bill 1. Bill 1 will amend the Retail Sales Tax Act to ensure that people in Ontario do not pay provincial sales tax on top of the GST. This delivers on a promise we made in our election campaign.

We have always been opposed to the federal goods and services tax. We said it was the wrong tax at the wrong time on the wrong people. Now we are acting to reverse the previous government's decision to increase its revenues by stacking the RST on the GST. We believe there is a fairer tax system for all people in Ontario.

We believe the people of this province are looking to us for leadership. That is why we are committed to passing a Safe Drinking Water Act and an environmental bill of rights. The people of Ontario have told us it is time to take action on the environment.

We plan to make progress in negotiating self-government with the first nations of Ontario. They have been

waiting far too long for governments to take action on their legitimate goals.

This is by no means an exhaustive list of all the goals of this government, nor was the throne speech. That would be impossible to set out in one short speech. We also recognize that no government has all the answers. We are willing to listen. We want to hear new ideas, even when they come from the opposite side of the Legislature.

As the Minister of Revenue, I want to assure the people of Ontario that I am prepared to listen, and as the member for Port Arthur, I want to assure my constituents that in this government their voices will be heard.

As a member of the first New Democratic Party government in Ontario, I want to inform all Ontarians that our throne speech on 20 November 1990 was the beginning of fairness for all the people in Ontario.

Mr Phillips: I am pleased to have an opportunity to continue the debate on the speech from the throne. I guess I had three overarching thoughts as the speech from the throne was presented.

The first thing was, frankly, something of a sense of disappointment in the tone of the speech from the throne. I had firmly felt that after the New Democratic Party waited all these years, we would have a speech from the throne that kind of lifted the heart. I think it is fair to say that virtually everyone who came here that day left feeling a little let down. Rather than a speech that set for the people of this province a vision of where this government wanted to go, it was, in my opinion, a bit of a compromise between perhaps what the party felt and thought.

I think a danger the party opposite ran into is that those people in the party who now are looking at getting re-elected are beginning to compromise some things. I believe that quite strongly. As I say, I think most people who were here left feeling: "Is that all there is? We had expected more, we had expected a better vision of the future."

One specific aspect I might highlight is in terms of the party's vision of this country. My concern is that if we look at the vision of Canada purely in economic terms, we are in for some real difficulty. The Premier, in terms of the speech from the throne and comments made afterwards, cast the unity issue in economic terms. I believe it is much bigger than that. The speech from the throne, in many respects, rather than lifting the vision of the people of Ontario and, indeed, the people of Canada, did not do that. That concerns me.

The second thing in the speech from the throne is, I believe, when we talk about integrity. The document by which the government will be judged, like it or not, will be the document where the real consultation took place; in the speech from the throne we talk about consultation. There was a major consultation that took place on 6 September, and the people of Ontario have spoken. Frankly, while it is somewhat difficult for us to accept that, we do accept it. We all believe strongly in democracy. The people spoke on 6 September. We are now the opposition and will perform that role to the best of our ability. But that was a consultation, and the document the people were consulted on was called *An Agenda for People*.

I assure the government that it will be this document that people will judge it on. As time goes on, the document will be pulled out and people will ask how the government has done in achieving this.

As I say, it was the biggest consultation that can possibly take place, the major one we all go through, where everyone in this province has a chance to tell us what their views are.

Certainly, if I were on the government side, I would begin to have some questions I may be asking in caucus. First, if you look at the various promises that were made in terms of tax reform, in the speech from the throne those things were referred to a commission to look at. But it does not say, "We will refer them to a commission and we'll ask the commission to tell us how we are going to implement these things." It does not say that. It just says, "We will refer them to the commission."

My judgement is that the government should have said: "We are going to implement these things. The people have told us they want us to implement these things. Now the commission must look at them and tell us how to implement them."

That is not the only one. As we go down the list of the major commitments made by the government during the election: "We are going to study those things. We are going to send it to a commission." Those are all possibly—I hope not, but possibly—delaying tactics to avoid actually doing it. Again, that caused me some concern as I listened to the speech from the throne.

As I say, if it had been referred in the tax area to the commission and said, "Commission, you tell us how to implement the things we have promised"—but that was not what was done in the speech from the throne.

In education funding, as some of the members across know, that promise of 60% funding for education was a very firm commitment. Certainly the teachers of this province very strongly endorse that and will be monitoring this government very closely on the performance of that commitment. But there was nothing in the speech from the throne, which I know is causing some considerable concern in the educational community.

1520

It also is true in the child care area, where very specific commitments were made and, as the speech from the throne unfolded, an apparent backing off. I hope I am wrong on that, but I go down the whole *Agenda for People* and compare it to the speech from the throne.

Minimum corporate tax: referred to the commission. Tax elimination for the working poor: referred to the commission. Succession duty, speculation tax, all to the commission. Education funding: so far, no firm commitment to that. I hope the Treasurer, when he announces the grants to the school boards, will make a major step forward on that, but we will await that. Pay equity: I had fully expected and I think over the next few weeks we should have from the government its plans for pay equity, because, as members know, companies are required to post their plans January 1. We are less than a month away from that right now and there is no legislation from the government. The child care area I have spoken of.

The social assistance plans: a \$300-million-a-year commitment the government began to move towards, but only began to move towards.

And all the way down. The non-profit subsidies, the northern fund and the four-laning for the highway: very specific plans, and if my understanding is correct—certainly there is no mention in the speech from the throne—the Premier has indicated that those may have to wait some considerable time, maybe even until after the next election.

The government can say, “Yes, but those promises were made before we knew there was a recession,” but, as I think the members across will know, on page 2 of *An Agenda for People* it says, “Ontario is now in a recession.” Members are going to have substantial difficulty in backing off of the promises made by saying, “Well, we didn’t know there was a recession.” Indeed they did, and indeed in the document it says, “Ontario is now in a recession.” Certainly the Treasurer will say, “Well, when we arrived we didn’t realize there was a deficit.” He knew there was a recession. He knows that indicates a lessening of revenue and he knows that indicates an increase in costs, and those were the two major reasons for the deficit.

As much as I think the government would like to find a way to back off its commitments, I think the people of Ontario will say: “No. When we voted for you, you said there was recession. You made those promises knowing that. You’re not going to be able to back off those.”

That was my second concern as I listened to the speech from the throne, a concern that the government was beginning to try to back off what I think will be the major judge of their integrity, that is, its performance on its commitments made in *An Agenda for People*.

The third area of concern to all of us is just the economy and how all of us are going to provide help to turn the economic situation around. Certainly there is a lot we can do to cushion the impact of the recession. We all appreciate that we have to find our way to work out of it, and that means creating jobs. One of the challenges for this government I think will be that the solution for that does rest on co-operation among the four groups that were mentioned in the speech: Labour, the business community, the governments and community groups. The challenge I think the government will face is that when the word “labour” is used in its agenda it has quite a specific meaning: Organized labour. I appreciate that, but they are—one of the members is shaking his head.

Mr Mammoliti: No, two of the members.

Mr Phillips: Two of the members? Great. Then I feel a lot more comfortable that when the word “labour” is used in their agenda it does not mean organized labour; it means all of the people who work in Ontario. Members nod their heads and I appreciate that. That makes me feel more comfortable, because I think that is going to be important as we work our way out of the recession, that we have that co-operation among all of the people who work in Ontario, not just organized labour. As I say, it is comforting to know that the consultations will involve more

than just organized labour, that all of the people of Ontario will be involved. I am pleased with that assurance.

Just to conclude my comments on the speech from the throne and the three concerns I have, as I say, I was disappointed in what I felt was a lack of vision in the speech from the throne. My opinion is that it was because people, some, already are beginning to say: “Well, wait a minute. We may have a vision, but we’ve got to get re-elected.” As soon as you start doing that, it is the road to not getting re-elected.

The second thing is that *An Agenda for People* will be the true measurement of the government’s integrity, and it will be held up each time it comes before community groups. I think that will be the report card on integrity.

The third one, which I am reassured on today, is that when the word “labour” is used in the speech from the throne it means not organized labour but all of the employees of the province. I appreciate that clarification.

Those are my thoughts on the speech from the throne. I wish the government the very best of luck, because I think we all share in an attempt to build a better Ontario. We have our role in opposition, which I hope we will perform well. The NDP has its role in government, which I hope it will perform well, as well.

Mr Turnbull: It is a great privilege to rise and participate in this historic debate, historic as the first NDP throne speech. I am proud and honoured to be standing here in this House as a new member and the representative from York Mills. I welcome the challenge and I will devote all of my energy and ability to prove myself worthy of the confidence placed in me.

I would ask the indulgence of the House as I take just a moment to acknowledge the achievements of my predecessors in the riding. Because of redistribution, my riding is comprised of parts of four old ridings: York Mills, Don Mills, Oriole and Armourdale, each of which has been represented by ministers of the crown in the cabinet of Premier William Davis.

The people of my riding are fortunate to have had so many extraordinarily talented and devoted individuals as their members. I am humble to follow in their footsteps.

Dr Bette Stephenson, who distinguished herself throughout her career, quickly became a role model for other women who aspire to political office. She was the first Minister of Labour, the first woman Minister of Health, the first woman Minister of Education, the first woman Treasurer, the first woman Deputy Premier and the first woman president of the Canadian Medical Association. Her competence, brilliance and kindness were such that she will be remembered by all veteran members with fondness and esteem.

Bruce McCaffrey represented the Armourdale section of my riding from 1977 to 1987 and is particularly remembered for his commitment to pension reform. The House became a duller place when he retired, for his fine sense of humour was missed.

Dennis Timbrell, MPP for York Mills, was one of the youngest cabinet ministers in this House. During his long and illustrious career he held five cabinet positions, serving the people of Ontario with dedication and distinction.

John Williams, from the riding of Oriole, is well remembered for his devotion to his constituents.

The first Liberal to be elected in York Mills, Brad Nixon, represented the constituency from 1987 to 1990.

My community, the riding of York Mills, is a metropolitan area that represents a broad cross-section of our society, from the largest, richest properties to subsidized housing units. It holds within its boundaries people of every cultural, family and work group. Problems exist, although maybe not as abundantly as in some ridings, but they are important and deserve our close attention.

The residents of York Mills are hardworking, responsible taxpayers, the very backbone of our province. Knowing what it is to work hard, to save and be fiscally responsible, they believe it is only right that their government should have the same sense of responsibility.

I must say, my sympathy goes out to the government as it tries to establish its priorities in the light of the terrible economic mess left by the Liberal administration. Faced with both a crushing deficit and a recession, the challenge is to find ways to implement its policies.

With this in mind, I must also point out that the Agenda for People, circulated during the election, contained a great many promises. The Ontario government should be commended for not moving forward with many of these expensive policies. In fact, it would be irresponsible to push forward. However, my constituents are really disappointed that they are not going to get the free, energy-efficient refrigerators, stoves and microwaves promised to everybody by the honourable member for Hamilton Mountain just after the election.

1530

We will support those initiatives we believe to be in the best interests of the people, but we remind the Premier that when we believe a course of action is not good for the province we will say so loud and clear. My constituents are worried, worried that the government will pay for its expensive platform by increasing taxes. Five years of Liberal government has left Ontario the most heavily taxed province in Canada. This unfavourable tax structure hurts consumers, who ultimately pay the higher price for goods, and workers, who are finding fewer jobs in the marketplace.

The growing burden of taxation has reduced Ontario companies' ability to compete. Bankruptcies have increased dramatically. Firms can move to more attractive tax jurisdictions and take jobs out of the province. Many have already done so; more will surely follow if this government fails to reduce the crushing load. I encourage the Treasurer to be creative and to find money for programs in ways other than raising tax.

The throne speech offered workers many safeguards when losing a job but did not provide one concrete inducement to keep companies in the province or to create jobs in the private sector. Relief for job loss may temporarily ease the pain for the worker, but it is only a bandage on the problem of unemployment. A growing economy is the ultimate safeguard for workers and for our standard of living. This government must stop driving jobs out of Ontario with a program that is too expensive in hard economic times.

My firsthand experience growing up in Britain was that socialism does not work. The country was on its knees as the sick man of Europe after years of old-fashioned socialist intervention until a pragmatic dose of Conservatism restored its health and prosperity. Winston Churchill once stated, "The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings; the inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries." Let us hope these predictions do not hold true in Ontario in 1990.

Interjection.

Mr Turnbull: I am most flattered that members find these comments stinging, but they are very important and I want members to consider them in the years ahead.

A major area of concern for my constituents is property tax reform. We were most disappointed it was not mentioned in the throne speech. The previous government shifted the cost of providing many public services on to municipalities, placing an unbearable tax burden on the shoulders of property owners and tenants. Other provinces do not depend on property taxes as a major source of revenue. In Quebec, property taxes are just over one half of Ontario's. Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec have all virtually eliminated any link between property taxes and education funding.

My constituents are extremely disappointed to realize that the New Democratic Party election promise to fund 60% of education costs was just empty rhetoric. They appear to have taken a leaf out of the Liberal's campaign book: Make a promise on education funding during the election and ignore it after. I encourage the Premier to make a clear statement on his government's position on education funding.

Another area not covered by the throne speech is the government's plan regarding the imposition of market value reassessment in Metropolitan Toronto. This unfair, regressive location tax will, if implemented, cause seniors and other residents to be forced from their homes and apartments. It is unduly complicated, destabilizing, administratively expensive and it encourages appeals on property tax bills. Tenants are affected as much as property owners because an increase in property taxes is added to the regular rent. It is estimated that by 1996 the majority of tenants could be paying the equivalent of five months' rent per year in property taxes. Citizens from my riding want the \$20-million reassessment scheme planned by the defeated Liberal government to be cancelled, market value reassessment to be shelved and a fair property tax system to be implemented.

During the election campaign we were promised an immediate environmental bill of rights. We in the Progressive Conservative Party, support the government on this issue. Now in the throne speech we hear that the Minister of the Environment plans to consult the public before taking action. When the honourable member was in opposition, she introduced a private member's bill on the environment four times over the past five years. Where is the bill now?

One of the horror stories in my riding of York Mills is the state of the Don River. Even though the cleanup of the

Don has been a high profile item in the media over the last 18 months, there is no discernible strategy to actually get things moving. Individual groups of citizens have banded together on many occasions to blitz projects to collect litter along the banks. These efforts are most commendable and demonstrate the seriousness with which my constituents view the Don. However the minister, as well as everyone in the city, should be concerned, since this river, which has become a sewer, empties into Lake Ontario, the source of Toronto's drinking water.

We are indeed fortunate that in the middle of the big city we have rivers and ravines accessible to most of our population. Within a few minutes of most residences one can experience the calming atmosphere of water, grass, trees and birds, but the pollution and erosion of our natural environment has placed all of these areas in jeopardy. Today, concern for the environment—in fact, concern for the survival of the planet—has reached global proportions. We all know there is not much time left to clean up our act. Hopefully, the government will make this a top priority.

Tenants comprise almost one half of my community and they need affordable, properly maintained apartments. I wish to remind the honourable Minister of Housing that it was his colleagues, in partnership with the Liberal government, who devised the present rent review legislation. This legislation has resulted in only one area of agreement between landlords and tenants—both agree it is a disaster.

The new policy proposed by the Minister of Housing would be another disaster, for it fails to address the critical questions of maintenance, renovation and supply. In fact, it discourages all new construction of rental units. I ask the Premier to bring in legislation which will recognize the legitimate needs of both landlords and tenants.

I would like to thank my constituents for the trust they placed in me on 6 September and I will endeavour to live up to their trust.

1540

Mr Drainville: I would like to offer my felicitations to the various Speakers who will be presiding at this House and the support that will be given to them over the months ahead. I would also like to say that I stand here as a person following in the footsteps of a very fine politician, John Eakins, who represented Victoria-Haliburton for 15 years. In that time, he was distinguished for his eloquence as well as for his kind support for all people. He is a very great man indeed, and this day I want to do him honour by saying how proud I am to stand in this place after him.

We have looked at many issues over this throne speech debate. We have seen the opportunities that we have as a government to begin to lead the province of Ontario into new directions. I am very thankful indeed that I have an opportunity just to highlight some of the issues that have been raised in the throne speech and issues that have been raised by my colleagues in the government benches over the last period of time.

It is important that we say at the outset that our party has always been committed to the philosophy of equity in

society. We can see that in terms of the pay equity law that is presently in existence, we as a government are going to begin to move into a stance of looking at that law and beginning to change it to make it more applicable to the totality of our society in Ontario. Employment equity is absolutely necessary in the age that we live in. We know that our government is committed to this and it has indicated so in the throne speech. We await that legislation to come forward in the life of our government.

There is no question that as a party that has been committed over the years to the needs and aspirations of workers in every part of this province, we need to take seriously the plight of workers, particularly in the time of recession. I draw attention, in particular, to the work that is going to be done after the throne speech to provide wage protection in terms of workers who experience their employment's terminating because of bankruptcy and support for labour adjustment committees in the industries affected by dislocation and to introduce stronger measures on layoff notice, severance and other adjustment issues. If we look at this whole package of our response to those who work in this province, this basically is a commitment to justice in the workplace. It has been fundamental in our party that we have believed in this since the beginning. It is fundamental that it is part of our platform now and it is fundamental that it is part of our throne speech. We look forward to the time when we can see that workers in Ontario have the opportunities and the supports they need to live a prosperous life, a life that is committed to providing service to the whole of this community.

One of our concerns has to be the problems in the agricultural community. In my own riding of Victoria-Haliburton we are experiencing great problems as we look at the difficulty of stabilizing farm incomes. Their present levels have been raised in the debate. If they were to be stabilized at their present levels, then we would see the farm economy go down the tubes. We need to do more. Indeed, it is the aim of this government. As we have seen in terms of the public utterances of its ministers and in terms of the throne speech debate, we are committed to ensuring that the farm incomes are stabilized in Ontario. For that, I want to say that I am proud to be a New Democrat and to see the moves that we are making in the agricultural areas.

We realize that we have a five-year mandate, a mandate in which there are going to be many needs expressed by people in society. In that five-year mandate we are going to see an increase in the minimum wage to 60% of the average industrial wage. That is necessary. It is necessary and I have seen it as I have worked in the area of helping people who are low-income, those who are in poverty. We have seen the need for people to have an adequate wage and salary so that they can maintain themselves and ensure that they do not have to resort to places like food banks. We look also for the expansion of the supply of affordable housing that our own Minister of Housing has indicated in the last week. We will see an extension of child care services. Last, we want to see a continuation of the reform of Ontario's social assistance system.

In all of these things, we see a move in terms of our philosophy of government to invite the people of Ontario to an experience of good government, an experience that will draw them to the conclusion that, as the New Democratic Party has always stood for the needs and aspirations of all people, so we will continue to do in the future.

In terms of this debate, I want to respond to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking a couple of weeks ago, he objected to the words in the throne speech, "As a group of people accustomed to being on the outside of the established power structures in Ontario, my government will open Queen's Park to those who have never before had an effective voice in the corridors of power." This was also raised by the leader of the third party.

I make no bones about it. I look at these benches, the government benches of which I am a member, and I remember the years when I walked up and down the halls of these corridors of power, when I tried to seek an opportunity to speak with ministers and deputy ministers about issues of poverty, hunger and oppression in our society, and I have got to say those doors were not open to me. The very day that the election was called in 1985 I sat with the honourable member for Bruce. He was talking to us about food banks. I have to tell members that was the first discussion I had with the honourable member and it was the last discussion, because he ended up in government just a short time after that.

What I would like to say is that there is no question that if we really think carefully about who has had access to power in this province, it has been those who have a way into the business community, those who have had people of prestige and power behind them. As I look at these government benches, what I see are workers, people who know what it means to make a wage, people who know what it means to have worked in very difficult and sometimes oppressive conditions, people who have seen life from the other side. I say today in this House and in this throne speech debate that it is my honour and my privilege to represent a government that knows the people and has made a place for the people in the halls of power of Ontario.

Mr Ruprecht: Madam Speaker, let me first congratulate you and so many of your colleagues on arriving here after being somewhat bruised, I guess, in combat of the electoral process. Since time limitations do not permit my throne speech to cover all subjects, I have chosen to limit my remarks, in general terms, to the economy and specific aspects of social policy. And yes, I will be making some recommendations.

There is no secret that we are in the midst of an economic crisis, and it might get worse. That, in no small measure, is due to our inability to control our own economy and events. We all know that over 90% of the Canadian auto industry is foreign-controlled, over 95% of rubber products, over 80% in chemicals, over 80% aircraft, over 80% electrical products, over 90% of all industry, especially in terms of patents. In the years between 1957 and 1977, the foreign patents that were taken out in On-

tario were foreign-owned or foreign-controlled; certainly they were made by foreign applicants.

Now, of course, we see the sale of Consumers' Gas. The grim fact of foreign takeover of Canadian industry is really frightening. Since free trade, especially, we in Canada have had to take the major brunt of making us, on the global economy side, fairly unstable and unable to continue the competitiveness that we so desperately need to maintain our high standard of living.

Never has a country lost control over its economy so quickly—with provincial consent, I might add. Now, of course, we have to pay the price for our policies and we have to pay the price for our neglect. The free trade deal today does not serve us well and will not serve us well. Included in free trade, of course, is the high Canadian dollar which makes our competitiveness internationally much worse.

Now we are in the throes of new discussions where the federal government necessarily has to get into the fray of ensuring that Canada will have a voice on this continent and discuss a new deal with the United States and Mexico. I only hope that the Premier of today will ensure that he will do what he possibly can so that we in Ontario and Canada will not be in a position that we have to reopen negotiations, because that is what our mighty neighbour to the south wants us to do, to reopen and to talk in terms of pharmaceuticals and in terms of subsidies.

1550

We would recommend to the Premier that he use his powers wisely and well to ensure that these negotiations with Mexico, when they take place, will not directly or indirectly hinge on a new deal that will leave us out in the cold or that will open up our trade practices with the United States, which would include pharmaceuticals and subsidies. We therefore urge the Premier to show some leadership.

Speaking of leadership, we have a great urgency in that if we want to be globally competitive, we have to be competitive in a way that permits our workforce to use its skills and new technology to ensure that we can trade with other countries. To do that, of course, we need a new skills development strategy. We have seen in the throne speech that thousands of workers are being laid off, and yet does the New Democratic Party have plans for job creation? No; no plans to hire or to find new work for those who have been laid off, no plans to offer to put them back to work.

This government has no specifics to offer on skills training, and no skills training programs have yet been offered in this Legislature. When we read the Premier's report on skills and how we become competitive internationally, we know what we need to do. We need a strategy that aims for competitiveness and education that provides the basic skills to participate in the economy, the freedom of choice in one's career and full access to that chosen career. I urge this Premier and this government to act quickly so that this workforce will be competitive.

Finally, let me talk quickly about an item that is very important in my life as a member of the provincial Parliament and for the residents of the area that I represent. We

have had a number of recommendations from the city of Toronto and from Metropolitan Toronto council dealing specifically with an anti-drug strategy. The Solicitor General stood up right here on 21 November and talked about the anti-drug week, and yet these kinds of platitudes will not serve us well because we need specific programs and specific recommendations. Even the mayor of the city of Toronto says, "I am disappointed that the provincial government yesterday gave no direction on whether or not they were going to finally put an end to the scandal of spending \$20 million of OHIP dollars for treatment in the United States."

Here in Canada, to become more competitive, we need our money for skills development, and yet we are spending over \$20 million every year to send our addicts to the United States to get treatment. We have no treatment facilities of any significance in the city of Toronto. It is serious, and we therefore recommend immediately to think about treatment facilities for our people and our residents so that we do not have to spend millions of dollars to send them to the United States. It is outright shocking that this kind of situation should persist and we recommend that this kind of strategy be discussed in the Legislature as quickly as possible.

The other recommendation that was made by Metropolitan Toronto council, and the city of Toronto supported it highly, was that of Metro licensing. The provincial government needs, I think, to support these recommendations. The Legislature here granted the city of Windsor powers to impose conditions on the issuance of licences, to suspend or revoke licences. I am thinking of doughnut shops and other places where people hang out in the evening.

Why not bring this kind of recommendation forward so the cities, like Metro and other cities across Ontario, have the right and power to shut stores and some businesses down that are implicated in this kind of a drug deal.

Finally, we simply ask that consideration be given to the Highway Traffic Act, the licence suspension. It is recommended in this report that the Highway Traffic Act be amended to include a provision that would result in an automatic driver's licence suspension for a period of up to one year for persons convicted of dealing in drugs.

These recommendations are important, and we would ask that this government take them seriously, because our people are hurting.

Mr Arnott: As I rise in this crowded assembly to give my maiden speech in response to the speech from the throne, I am overcome by a feeling of reverence for this chamber and its members. I am humbled and honoured that the people of Wellington have chosen me to represent them.

I am doubly humbled when I recall the tireless toil which friends, family and supporters exhibited so that I might be here. And I am doubly honoured to have been selected to succeed as the member for Wellington one of the finest people I have ever known, Jack Johnson, who served the people of Ontario with compassion, integrity, sincerity and dedication for 15 years. His is an example we

would all do well to emulate. I join the people of Wellington in saying thank you to Jack Johnson.

Now as we enter a new decade, it is my responsibility to articulate the beliefs and the concerns of the people of Wellington to this assembly. It is a responsibility I take very seriously.

We in Wellington understand the economic value of hard work and the social value of personal responsibility. From this understanding stems a serious concern when our government refuses to live within its means, when our government grows until it begins to inhibit overall economic growth, when even excessive taxation does not prevent the expansion of our government debt. My party's leader has expressed these concerns for many years, and I wish to echo these concerns today.

In his response to the speech from the throne, my leader mentioned his surprise that young people are not taking to the streets to protest government waste, extravagance and a crippling debt, for which they ultimately will be responsible. Young people who are concerned about big government may not be in the streets, but I can assure members that some have taken seats in this assembly and will be vigilantly advocating that we first restrict the growth of government and then gradually bring it back to a level which we can afford.

We in Wellington want action on the environment. We want accessible health care and quality education for our children. We want to preserve Canada's traditions. We want government to enact laws which will allow agriculture and small business to flourish, so that we can have hope for the future. We want accountable, accessible local government. We want to keep Sundays for families and for worship.

If we all listened to the people of Wellington and acted accordingly, Ontario would be well served and better off.

I have listened to many honourable members' responses to the throne speech, and a great many members have commented that the Ontario public is tired of the old-style politics and the way some politicians have acted in the past. I agree.

Politicians, being human beings, though, have always acted in their own best interests. As long as we have politicians, they will be tempted by the expedient course, by the course which seems to ensure re-election. Today, that course lies in ignoring what may superficially seem to be the most politically acceptable and opportune route in favour of what we truly believe to be right. If we expend our energy on Machiavellian manipulations and efforts to be perceived as being strong on this issue or that, we should not be here, and we will not be here long, for the Ontario public deals harshly with politicians whose greatest interests are selfish.

1600

The Ontario public had its say on 6 September and a historic new government was formed—the first New Democratic Party government in Ontario. I want to see good government in Ontario. While I have profoundly, fundamentally and philosophically disagreed with much of what the New Democrats espoused while they were in opposition, I am willing to give them an opportunity to

bring forward their program and their agenda, since they have been elected to do so.

However, I hope to make a strong contribution within our party, pressing the new government to listen to our case, our agenda, which it will ignore at its peril.

A common thread running through many of the oral questions raised by opposition members to this government to date has been the great gulf which exists between the NDP election platform, *An Agenda for People*, and the announcements which are coming forth today from the new government. One might almost conclude that the opposition parties in this assembly are pressing the government to meet its election commitments as outlined in *An Agenda for People*.

I can only say that I thank providence that this gulf does in fact exist between NDP election promises and some recently announced government policies, directly because I do believe in good government. I hope that the new executive council does not delay in further repudiation of some of that particular document's more outlandish platitudes and absolutely impractical premises.

In closing, I wish once again to allude to the seriousness and importance of our duties in this assembly. The Premier has stated on several occasions that he did not expect to assume the office he presently holds. A logical corollary suggests that many members in this assembly did not expect to win the seats they presently occupy.

I sincerely hope that all members will approach their duties and responsibilities with appropriate seriousness and dedication which the present occasion demands.

Ms Churley: It is my pleasure today to participate in this debate on the throne speech as the member for Riverdale. I believe on the first day of the House, I paid tribute to David Reville. I would like to today mention again that I am very proud and honoured to be following in David Reville's footsteps. As well, members may remember Jim Renwick, who passed away in 1985 and had served Riverdale for many years and was well loved in our community and, I think, well respected in this House.

There is a strong Riverdale tradition, as many of the members here know, the NDP has been serving that community and, may I add, quite well for some time now and I am proud to follow in that tradition.

I came to politics fairly recently as an environmental activist from Riverdale, as well as the past executive director of the Canadian Environmental Defence Fund. I am, therefore, very pleased to have been appointed the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment. I feel that I have some knowledge and am, therefore, able to contribute to that portfolio at these very difficult times.

I would like to point out that the throne speech says very clearly, and I would just like to quote a line from it: "There is an environmental crisis facing Ontario and it will require an extraordinary effort to meet it. We accept our duty to the future." This government is prepared to meet that challenge.

Right now all the focus is on solid waste management, and there is a good reason for that. We can see it, we can smell it, we can see the trucks go by. Also, of course, the previous government pussyfooted around the issue and did

not come up with the kinds of regulations that were necessary.

I would like to take this opportunity, however, to thank the previous government for the work that was done and the beginnings of some of the regulations that now have to be put in place on the 3Rs. Unfortunately, that government did not get serious about it and actually relaxed the soft drink quotas for reusable bottles. That is a very direct symbol of the kind of throwaway society that we live in, and this government is prepared to get tough on regulating, when necessary, the kinds of reusable materials that we are now throwing into the garbage.

The other thing that is mentioned and has been mentioned by the minister is that we will keep our commitment to full environmental assessments for garbage dumps in anybody's neighbourhoods.

One of the great significant points to me however in the throne speech is the commitment to the Safe Drinking Water Act because, believe it or not, solid waste is not our most serious environmental problem. Millions of tonnes of hazardous wastes, millions, are pumped deliberately and often legally into our lakes and rivers, and these toxic wastes—you cannot see them; they do not drive by us in trucks—are persistent and they build up in food chains. We do not even know what they do to us ultimately down the line and our sewer systems are not designed to handle them. Finally, this clean drinking water act will begin to deal with the problems of hazardous wastes going into our drinking water. As well, some of the work that was done by the previous government, the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement program, which is very, very good and lays the groundwork for the beginnings of stopping hazardous wastes from going into our waters—I again would like to thank the previous government for beginning such a fine program and this government will be proud to be able to pick that up and continue with it because it is a very good program.

Mr Ruprecht: Put your application in; we might accept you.

Ms Churley: As I was saying, this is finally—and I do not want to be a Liberal, no; I am very proud to be a New Democrat. We will pick up on some of the fine programs they started, however.

As a member of city council I worked hard to get environmental issues on the table and I will continue to do that here. These issues have been, of course, of prime concern to my constituents in Riverdale. Riverdale—south Riverdale, in particular—has been a dumping ground for a very long time for garbage and for polluting industries and I think that this is a perfect opportunity for me to pay tribute to the residents of south Riverdale who have worked so hard over the years to get, in particular, the lead cleaned up in south Riverdale. For years and years and years, they fought to be listened to and it took many years to get the attention of any government. Finally, tests were done and lo and behold it was determined that many of the children in south Riverdale had in fact very high lead counts and, as we all know, this can cause serious brain damage. The citizens of Riverdale have been very active

for a long time and at the forefront of the environmental community groups in the city of Toronto and have in fact been at the forefront of some of the waste management issues that we are now in the thick of.

I would like to thank as well the residents of Riverdale for giving me their overwhelming vote of confidence. I have to brag a little bit and say that I did win every poll and I like to think that that is because of the work that was done before me by my predecessors and by the work that I was involved in at city hall. But I pledge to these good people of Riverdale that I will continue fighting for the things that matter to them, as I did at city council, and those are equality for women and visible minorities, a safe environment and social justice.

I would like to conclude by saying that I believe that every member in this House came to office because they too care about social justice and a clean environment and that despite the criticisms that have been given on the throne speech, some legitimate and some not so legitimate, when necessary we will all co-operate and we will all work together to do what we were elected to do, and that is to improve and enhance the lives of the people of Ontario, not only the people of this generation, but the generations to come.

1610

Mr Grandmaitre: First, I would like to congratulate all the new faces in this place, in this crowded place—overwhelming. My remarks will be short, will be brief, but to the point, because I want to give an opportunity for every one of us to have a chance to talk about the throne speech and the lack of direction. That is exactly how the people of Ottawa East, the people of eastern Ontario, feel about the lack of direction in the first NDP throne speech.

Interjection.

Mr Grandmaitre: I know the minister responsible for francophone affairs will heckle me, but that is okay. I can take it. He has not received his first question yet, but I might get him next week.

The people of Ontario had a right to expect more than they received in the NDP throne speech. People were expecting a clear sense of direction and a firm set of priorities in their first speech. The throne speech was a disappointing retreat from the bold promises made by the NDP during the election campaign.

All we have been hearing since we came back on 20 November is: “We’re consulting. We’re listening to groups, to individuals, to anybody who wants to listen.” I find it very strange that now they are telling us they are consulting with the people, and yet in August and even in the first week of September, I would like to ask the government, how come they made these electoral promises without consulting their own people? Now they say: “Well, look, we can’t keep all these promises. We have to go back to the people of Ontario and ask them what we should do.”

I find this very, very strange for a government that wanted to be in power, that promised the world—and they did. Now they say, “Because of the recession.” Well, the recession was in place back in August, but I suppose they

have forgotten about the recession of August. I find it very strange that they would even use the recession as an excuse.

Mr Speaker, I would like to talk about your favourite subject, eastern Ontario, and my own riding of Ottawa East. As you know, people in eastern Ontario expected a lot. We welcomed the NDP’s commitment to follow through on a Liberal promise to relocate civil service jobs to communities right across the province of Ontario. The government was dragging its heels, as you know, on this issue, because of pressure from the civil service unions, but with pressure from the Liberals and from members of the communities affected by those decisions, finally the government came through. Congratulations.

Also, we welcome the government’s decision to provide \$700 million for public works projects. Although this program will re-employ some workers, it does not provide much hope for the thousands of workers in manufacturing, agriculture, resource development and single-industry communities who are being hurt by the recession. Workers who have been laid off today have none of the protection the NDP talked about while it was campaigning across this province. There is nothing in the throne speech that will encourage business people to invest, both at home or abroad.

I think this is a golden opportunity for me to remind the government that a cabinet committee existed of eight different ministries. It was a newly appointed committee made up of the ministries of Tourism and Recreation, Agriculture and Food, Industry, Trade and Technology, Education, Skills Development, senior citizens’ affairs, Colleges and Universities. As you know, Mr Speaker, we are not being favoured in eastern Ontario. They have a Minister of Northern Development and they have a minister for the greater Toronto area, but we do not have a minister responsible for eastern Ontario. We do not have such a minister. I feel very sad that in the throne speech nothing gave us an indication the committee would be reinstated. I implore the government to do so as soon as possible.

This committee had given the eastern Ontario members some faith that finally, instead of Metro or Toronto, eastern Ontario would be recognized as a very important section or part of this province. I think we have a great deal to offer in eastern Ontario and I think the new NDP government should take advantage of that golden opportunity and reinstate that committee as soon as possible.

Comme je l’ai annoncé, je ne voudrais pas prendre tout le temps nécessaire — je veux permettre à tous mes collègues de dire un mot. Mais par contre, je dois vous dire à quel point les gens de l’Est de l’Ontario étaient déçus du discours du trône.

Comme vous le savez, Monsieur le Président, les francophones de l’Ontario attendaient avec impatience ce premier discours. La raison en était majeure : c’est que le gouvernement néo-démocrate avait promis la lune, avait promis une université de langue française, avait promis une province bilingue, mais pas un mot de cela dans le discours.

Alors, c'est une des questions, peut-être, que je vais poser au ministre responsable des Affaires francophones. J'ai été flagellé, j'ai été crucifié pendant quatre ans et demi, alors c'est au tour du ministre d'être crucifié. Il va entendre parler de moi, et non seulement de moi, mais de l'Est de l'Ontario. Le ministre a fait des promesses, maintenant c'est à lui de se rendre responsable et de tenir ses promesses électorales ; alors, que le ministre se prépare.

Mr Ruprecht: He will get the chance.

M. Grandmaître : Oui, le député aura sûrement sa chance.

Monsieur le Président, comme vous le savez, le nouveau gouvernement avait répondu oui, sans exception, à toutes les questions de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario. Alors, je vais avertir le ministre que je vais lui poser une question sur chacune de ces promesses-là. Je veux connaître son agenda ; je veux savoir quand on va implanter ces programmes et quand les Franco-Ontariens doivent recevoir les services dus. Ce n'est pas une faveur qu'on demande, c'est un droit.

I will wind up by reminding the new NDP government that the Liberal Party's criticism policy will be a just one, a constructive one. It will be based on Liberal principles: the rights of individuals, the rights of equal opportunity, an activist government which remains fiscally responsible.

1620

Mr Jordan: It is a special privilege for me to have the opportunity to speak this afternoon with a fellow colleague from eastern Ontario in the chair. I would also like to mention at this time that I would like to congratulate the regular Speaker on his election to that high office and his very fair treatment of us, the new members.

I want to say that I am not only proud to represent the riding of Lanark-Renfrew, but to follow in the footsteps of a member of the calibre of Doug Wiseman, who represented the riding for 20 years. Doug did not allude to practices that lead to the public assessment of a politician that is being expressed today. I realize the tremendous responsibility and challenge ahead in attempting to build on his principles of government.

I would like to put forward the basic principles of honesty, integrity and accountability that go together to build character. It is on these principles that my wife and I have raised five children through the school system, all five ending up with university degrees, and on the basis that all five are well established as citizens of this province.

I will be serving the people of Lanark-Renfrew from this character base as I continue to explain and eventually be part of implementation of the policies of our Progressive Conservative Party.

Leading the way for me, not only in Lanark-Renfrew but with the people across this province is our leader, who encompasses all these qualities of which I have spoken.

The principles of government must be no different than the principles of life. The promises made by this government prior to the election were of such extreme that the reality of implementing them is impossible. In Lanark-Renfrew this is already leading to the question again of the

credibility of politicians. Why are they flip-flopping on their energy policy? Why are they flip-flopping on auto insurance and on the price of gasoline at the gas pumps? Why are they flip-flopping on their plans for the highways and their plans for waste management?

These are the same people who before the election claimed to the electorate to have the policies and the answers, and the people believed them.

The people in many areas of my riding are in desperate need of assistance due to layoffs, plant closings, pension funds being withheld and education and health costs continuing to soar. The people are looking to this government for those answers that were promised. I would like to make some suggestions to the government regarding projects adjacent to or in my riding that will give hope and relief to some of these people.

The riding of Lanark-Renfrew is fortunate in having an abundance of hydraulic sites for the generation of power; namely, High Falls, Carleton Place and Galetta on the Mississippi River, Mountain Chute, Barrett Chute and Stewartville and Arnprior on the Madawaska River, and also Chenaux and Chats Falls on the Ottawa River.

I draw to the attention of the Minister of Energy that the locations at High Falls, Carleton Place and Chats Falls require upgrading for increased capacity. The Chats Falls plant could be increased by 25% by installing two additional generators in the intakes already designed when the plant was built.

The initiation of these work programs, along with another major project under the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of Natural Resources, will be of great benefit to all concerned. The major project on the Ottawa River is what has been referred to over the years as part of the GRAND Ship Canal.

Studies were done in the 1930s and again in the 1970s on the feasibility of this project. I ask the Minister of Energy and the Minister of Natural Resources, in conjunction with the federal government, to seriously consider, immediately, that portion of the canal system between Constance Bay and Pembroke. This would allow navigation on the Ottawa River around the hydro dams and rapids which at the present time leave the river to such limited use that the recreation and tourist trade has not developed. The beautiful beaches and scenery, including the Laurentian mountains, along this route are second to none in the province of Ontario.

In conjunction with these projects, I would ask the Minister of Energy to consider directing Ontario Hydro to reinstitute its policy of landscaping and maintenance around its properties in Lanark-Renfrew and restore them to the tourist attractions that many people enjoyed in the years gone by. This warm and open concept not only attracts tourists, but is educational and gives understanding to the people of the tremendous responsibility Ontario Hydro has shouldered over the years in supplying abundant and low-cost power to the people of Ontario.

I suggest that these suggested projects will not only be the source of an efficient increase in the supply of energy to this province, but will restore confidence in the commitments made by the minister regarding utilization of all

sources of energy. The projects involving the upgrading of existing facilities require no environmental studies. They will provide employment in the construction and tourist industry.

I would also ask the minister to consider the relocation of Ontario Hydro's hydraulic engineering division to the town of Arnprior, the central location relative to 10 hydraulic plants in the eastern region. I would further ask the minister to consider the relocation of their customer service and conservation division for eastern region from rented quarters in Belleville to property already owned by Ontario Hydro in the town of Smiths Falls.

I am personally acquiring copies of previous studies on these projects and would welcome the opportunity to sit down and share this information with the ministers involved, as I have already arranged with the federal minister for Lanark-Carleton. The people of Lanark-Renfrew are aware of these great possibilities for their riding and they await a reply from this government.

Mr Silipo: I am pleased to join in the debate this afternoon, albeit perhaps a little briefly, given the agreement that was reached today.

First of all, Mr Speaker, I want to congratulate you on your election, and through you the other members of the presiding team. I think that although there seems to be a bit of a subdued air in the House this afternoon—I am not sure if it is due to the weather or due to the fact that we have done away with the question and comment session this afternoon—if the tenor of the debate in the previous week has been any indication, you and the other members of the presiding team will certainly not be bored in your position in the Chair.

I of course come to this House for the first time from the riding of Dovercourt. For those who do not know, the riding of Dovercourt is situated in the west end of the city of Toronto. It is an area that is home to many thousands of people who have come to this country and to this city from many parts of the world. I think it is a microcosm in that sense of the kind of society that I think we want for all of us.

I would be remiss if I did not, in my first address in the House, note and recognize some of the previous representatives from that area. I say representatives because of course, as a result of the redistribution that happened a few years back, the present riding of Dovercourt takes in a good chunk of the old riding of Dovercourt and the old riding of Bellwoods.

1630

I want to note and recognize Tony Lupusella, who represented the riding of Dovercourt for about 15 years. While I may not have been pleased about the fact that he decided a few years back that he was more comfortable being a Liberal than a New Democrat, I do want to note the contribution he has made to this House, particularly during his earlier years on the issue of workers' compensation and in bringing to this House and to this Legislature the plight of injured workers, something which I hope to be able to do as well in the months and years to come. I also want to note that he was of particular help to me when

I first began my public career as a school trustee. As I said, regardless of what may have happened politically and in a very partisan way, I do want to note in a very non-partisan way that this is something I will never forget, the help he was to me in the early years.

I also want to pay tribute to another person, Ross McClellan, who represented part of the area of Dovercourt, the old riding of Bellwoods. He, of course, served this House well in various capacities. I note in particular his role as the NDP House leader for a number of years, and particularly his role in negotiating the accord in 1985 that brought the Liberal government of that day to power and to the government.

I want to start from there and indicate that what happened around the accord, in my particular analysis, and what happened on 6 September are very linked. I think it is perhaps what happened during that time by the previous government in forgetting some of the sense of promise and openness and some of the sense of change that I think people saw in 1985. Quite frankly, in my view, that led to the defeat of the Liberal government this past September and the election of the New Democratic Party to power.

Certainly, as a member of the government, I can say quite clearly and openly that I never expected to be in this House on this side of the House. While I was confident in my ability to be elected, for various local reasons, I certainly did not expect, as I believe many of us on this side of the House expected, that we would be forming the government. I think we recognize, as many people, including our Premier, have indicated, that in fact the vote was as much a protest vote against the Liberal government as it was a vote for us, in terms of the electorate searching for a party to which they could turn who had some of the answers they were seeking.

For me, that realization, beyond just simply accepting that that is what happened, strikes at the heart of what the throne speech is all about. We have heard, and I think quite legitimately, some of the criticisms from both opposition parties to the throne speech, about how vague it is, about how it does not have this particular area or that particular section covered. I think one can only say that to some extent some of the comments they have made are quite accurate. In fact, the throne speech does not cover every conceivable area, but the throne speech, on the other hand, does not pretend to cover every conceivable area. What it does, and I think does very well, is set out some very key principles and elaborate to some extent on some of those areas.

I want to touch a little on some of those, but I particularly want to point out that in effect what has also happened in the weeks following the reading of the throne speech is that, as we had announced, various ministers have made various additional announcements on some important changes and some important improvements. I think that also is an indication of how we will be doing business.

I was pleased to see that within some of the key principles embodied in the throne speech there were some that touch very close to the heart of what I believe the constituents of Dovercourt would want to see from this government over the next number of years. During the

election, I certainly heard and talked about a number of issues, but particular among those were the concept of taxation and the fact that, while everyone agrees they need to pay taxes and that we all need to pay taxes, there was a great and growing sense among my constituents that the present tax system is very unfair. So I was pleased to see that through the Fair Tax Commission we will hopefully be addressing some of the inequities in the present tax structure which place an ever-increasing burden on those who are least able to pay. I am quite confident, as I say, that we can begin to address some of those inequities through that process.

There are obviously great concerns about the environment. Other members of this House have spoken at length and well on those, and I will not dwell on that except to say that I believe it is a concern we all have, to look at and continue to put forward measures that will safeguard and improve our environment, not just for our wellbeing but obviously for the wellbeing of those that will follow us.

There was one issue, however, that I think probably kept recurring throughout the election. I was glad to see that was the issue that opened the throne speech, that is, the concept of integrity. I see that as something that plays very much not only on the workings of the government but also in our own dealings on a day-to-day basis in how we deal with each other as government versus opposition parties and vice versa, and also in the way in which we deal on our own as individual representatives with our own constituents. In addition to the concept that I think is enshrined in the throne speech, of which we will no doubt be seeing some more details over the next few weeks and months around how we, as a government, can inject the greatest sense of integrity into that system, it seems to me that also inherent in that is our ability to admit to mistakes we may make from time to time and our ability to deal with the consequences of those mistakes. I have every faith in the members of the government who sit on this side, and I think that will more and more become the way in which we will be working.

There are a couple of other issues I want to touch on. I look forward to the comments we will be getting on the Constitution and what we will be doing as a government and as a Legislature to deal with that. In the post-Meech-Lake era we all, I think, want to try to come to grips with the problems that are there. In my view there are ways to both recognize the reality of Quebec as a distinct society and also to recognize the rights of native peoples and the multicultural reality of our city and of our country. I am one that believes very much that those things are congruent and do not have to be separate from one another.

I look forward, of course, to the announcements that will come forward, the process and the results we will reach in terms of a publicly owned, driver-owned car insurance plan.

I want to conclude by making two comments; I want to pick up again on some comments that came from some of the opposition party members. One is that the New Democratic Party does not have a monopoly on social consciousness, and I would certainly have to agree with that. If there is any one rule I have used in my years of public

life to date, it has been that one needs to continuously be able to reach out beyond partisan politics to members of all parties, because I think we all have a contribution to make in our own respective ways, whether that may be enshrined in a partisan or philosophical point of view—and I think that is also part of the system—or whether it goes beyond the views we may espouse from time to time as members of particular parties. I think that is also something we need to continue to search for.

It was mentioned earlier by more than one person that we will be judged in the end not on the throne speech but on An Agenda for People. A lot of people have waved this document around, and I for one not only am not afraid of being judged on An Agenda for People but agree that that is what we should be judged on. But I also wanted to say that in that context people ought to also be realistic and see the throne speech for what it is, which is the beginning of the process. I think the ledger sheet will really be tallied at the end of the four- to five-year period, and I think it is fair at that point for the opposition parties and indeed the public to be able to look at our record and say: "Well, here are the things you promised, NDP, and here are the things you actually managed to deliver on."

1640

I am very confident that when that ledger sheet is tallied, our record will be quite good. I am confident of that for a number of reasons: First, because we will have certainly a very active opposition, if the debate to date is any indication, who have taken it upon themselves to at some points be perhaps more socialist than the socialists. That is fine. I think it is quite a legitimate role for people to remind us of the promises we have made.

I hasten to add, however, that I think people ought also to be a little careful in not trying to continue to have it both ways, of criticizing us for not going far enough and then, when we do make a move, saying we are going too far. But I suppose that is the role of opposition to some extent.

There is another reason—in my view, in some ways perhaps an even more important reason—why I think in the end we will be judged well on the ledger sheet. It is not because we on this side of the House have all the answers. We do not. But I think we have a strong coalescence around the kinds of things we, as a government, believe need to happen. While we are still in the process of working out all of the ins and outs, and no doubt we will over the next number of years, we do come to those issues and to the many issues we need to deal with with a very similar kind of perspective. I think that will help us.

But I think more important than that is what we see as the role that each of us as members of the government needs to play. That is, as members of the government, we have not forgotten and we must never forget, that we also have a role almost as opposition: to continue to bring the issues of our constituents to this House, to the various committees, to our caucuses, in whatever way. I, for one, certainly intend to do that. I know that many people on this side of the House intend to do that as well.

I think in the end that is what will make us a good government: Our ability to continue to do those things, to

continue to play our role not only as representatives of the people who elected us but as real advocates.

I conclude by saying that I very sincerely look forward to the next few years in this House. I think there is a great deal of work we need to do and I think that the throne speech has set us on a good beginning on that road.

Mr Villeneuve: Mr Speaker, it is my first opportunity to get up in this chamber and debate since 6 September. I want to congratulate you, sir, for having been chosen as the Deputy Speaker. I know you will do a good job. Certainly I want to congratulate the elected Speaker, the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, for having been chosen by his peers, the members of this assembly, as our Speaker for this session of Parliament.

I welcome all the new members, most of them across the way in government, to Queen's Park. We will be looking very closely at the Hansards of some of their first speeches, and they will be saying several years down the road: "Did I really say that? If I did, why in the world did I say it?" We are just putting them on guard.

To the 10 new caucus members we have in the Progressive Conservative Party, I say welcome. They have come at a time when our party has just turned the corner and is a government in waiting, so I say to them welcome.

I want also to thank the constituents of the area I very proudly represent, that great part of southeastern Ontario, really the cradle of Ontario where it all began, Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry and East Grenville, parts of four rural counties and an area proud in tradition, where French, Irish, English and Scottish live side by side, well together, and hopefully will continue to do so for a long time to come.

Coming from a very rural riding, I will be touching on the plight of agriculture, the plight of eastern Ontario, economically and otherwise, and I will also be suggesting some ways and means of improving them.

We have, in the great riding I proudly represent, the St Lawrence Parks Commission, where five of our major parks were actually closed down. This, for a tourist attraction, is a terrible scenario and a terrible situation. One of them was reopened by a municipality last year and hopefully this year. I say to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation from the new government, we must reopen the four remaining parks that were closed throughout the summer of 1990. If we are going to attract tourists to that area, new money, new people, we must have all of our facilities open and readily available to the public.

On Highway 416, there was some question at some point not long ago that possibly we would be going beyond the previous government's originally scheduled 1999 completion. It is absolutely imperative that this twinning of Highway 16 into a four-lane be done and be done even sooner than 1999. It is most important to the economy of the area, to the tourist trade. Remember, when you cross from the United States into Ontario, a cowpath literally leads you to the nation's capital. We need Highway 416 and we need it now. We cannot afford to procrastinate on this one. As we look ahead from 1990, 1999 seems like an eternity ahead. It will come, but we must have Highway 416 fully completed by that time.

We also have the potential of a youth detention centre, a very beautiful facility known as the Seaway Training Institute at Morrisburg. We understand that the people of Ottawa are saying they want to keep the facility in the city of Ottawa, but "not in my backyard." Well, you can come to our backyard in Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry. We have the facility there on site and ready to be utilized. Our young offenders do need proper facilities and supervision, and we have those very facilities right along the seaway at Morrisburg.

I say to the Minister of Community and Social Services—it is great to see her here in the chamber this afternoon—that those facilities are readily available. I have been with two groups that have inspected them to this point. For whatever reason, possibly that it is a little large—but the price is right. I want to invite the minister personally to visit that particular Seaway Training Institute, which it was before. It is a beautiful facility. It may look slightly large right now, but possibly is exactly what we need for the future.

In agriculture, we have very definite great economic problems. Grain this year is selling for less than it sold 15 years ago, and that is for a long ton. Back in the old days, we sold a ton as 2,000 pounds; today, the tonne is 2,205 pounds and we are getting less money than we did in 1975.

One of the speakers earlier this afternoon touched on the fact that he was most happy with what had come out in the speech from the throne. In my humble opinion, the speech from the throne leaves a great deal to be desired when we speak of support for agriculture, the basic industry.

We take food for granted. When there was a slight slowdown in the movement of goods earlier this year and Highways 401 and 417 were lined up with trucks going nowhere, all of a sudden some of our supermarket shelves became a little bare and there was great consternation. "Where do we fill our food basket from?" If we do not look after our agricultural community, the very backbone of this province, we will have great difficulty. Once we have lost them, once they have lived the urban life, not many want to go back to milking cows, feeding hogs or beef or growing a crop when a large amount of capital is required and there is a very low return; indeed, this year in the grain situation, to break even is doing well.

Where else do you get this, particularly in a situation where this government is going to increase the minimum wage to somewhere above \$7 an hour? It may not be a lot of money for a lot of people, but in agriculture we have many people who are not earning anywhere close to that and they are working some very long hours and have a lot of capital invested.

1650

I will touch on realized net income just for a moment. We have had a reducing realized net income since 1983, reducing on an annual basis. When we look at this, we are basically somewhere in the area of about two thirds the return to our agricultural community that some people in the urban areas are making. I think it is very unfair and I think it is unhealthy for our province.

We have the possibility of new uses for crops. The fuel ethanol industry, I think, is on the verge of coming to Ontario. It has been operating in the United States; it has been operating in western Canada. I say to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, who has to be away for the next period of time, and I realize that, the fuel ethanol industry must come to eastern Ontario. A clean environment is what it promises, and new markets for our grain producers.

Finally—I know that time is of the essence and I have promised my remaining colleague for our party that I would give him as much time as I have taken—this government promised a minister for eastern Ontario. I know they will not deliver on many of their promises, and probably thank Heaven that they will not. I say that to them with all honesty and all earnestness. But they promised, many of their candidates in eastern Ontario, and the Premier himself, when he came to Cornwall, said, “You’ll have a minister of eastern Ontario.” We have lost thousands of jobs in the last 18 months, literally thousands of jobs in Cornwall and the area that I represent. I do not know whether a ministry of eastern Ontario could have solved that, but at least it could have addressed it, as the minister responsible for northern Ontario addressed it in today’s statement in a negative way but was here to talk about it.

I could go on and speak about the metropolis in the great riding that I represent, the town of Alexandria, which has been limited on expansion because of a sewage treatment system that is not adequate. It is a town of 3,300 people; it cannot expand. Limited expansion, we must address that.

Mr Speaker, I see that my time is up. Thank you very much for listening to me, and again, congratulations to you, sir.

Mr Ferguson: Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as Deputy Speaker, as well as to congratulate the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, who was elected by this assembly.

I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate the residents of my community who selected me to be here today to represent their interests. I want to say to the 46% of the residents of Kitchener riding that I certainly appreciate having the pleasure and the opportunity to represent them here today. To the 54% who did not support me, I want to let them know that I will certainly be working hard to earn their trust, confidence and respect so that perhaps they will be able to support me on the next go-round.

I think it is also fitting that I acknowledge the hard work, dedication and efforts of the previous member for the riding of Kitchener—in fact, the previous two members—David R. Cooke, who was the chair of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, as well as James Breithaupt, who served in this Legislature from 1967 until 1985. Both individuals, I know, worked hard on behalf of the residents of the community that I represent today and I think that they should be acknowledged because they both did excellent jobs on behalf of the residents of Kitchener.

I listened very intently over the last number of days to responses to the throne speech from not only members of the government side but also the opposition side, and I want to say that there has been a variety of speakers on the issue. I have listened to the Leader of the Opposition as well as to the leader of third party and I certainly appreciated, in a number of instances, the constructive comments that were put forth. I certainly appreciated the number of thoughtful and deliberate attempts on behalf of the other sides to make their views known to the government, especially those who took it in such a constructive, positive manner that they should put forth a message to us and that we should not only be listening but hearing what they are saying. I think that we on this side of the House, we the government members, certainly appreciate those people who have taken that time.

The throne speech itself—and I think perhaps this is lost many times—was essentially a speech about principle. I think it spoke of the values that many of us in this House share and it spoke of some of the common ground that we all share. I think too often, because democracy seems to be the adversarial approach, we lose out on the common ground that in fact we share. It talked about some of the economic realities, it talked about our faltering economy and some of the real difficulties that constituents are being put in as a result of the economy, as a result of the free trade agreement, as a result of the value of the current Canadian dollar, as a result of the high interest rate policy. I am not here to criticize, because we can do that at any time. Why I am here, and I hope all of us can share in this, is to build some common ground. We are all very clear about what the problems are that need to be addressed out there, but I think where we have difficulty is building the bridges in order to resolve some of those problems.

The throne speech, which was very much about the principles that this government and this party stand for, talked about integrity in government. That is a question that I know each member is concerned about, especially when we read that a number of surveys have been taken by a number of surveying organizations, such as Gallup and Environics, that rate the politician or somebody who decides to serve in public life somewhere around sixth or seventh on the totem pole in terms of trust and/or respect.

The throne speech also spoke of fairness. It talked about fairness for the individual, which many of us believe has been lacking. It also spoke about fairness to communities, which I, as the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, am obviously concerned about. Perhaps more important, it touched on some of the minority groups that have not been included in the throne speech before, such as our first nations people, Franco-Ontarians and in fact a wide diversity of multiracial or multicultural groups.

This government has been criticized a number of times, not about what was in the throne speech, but in fact what was left out. I find that odd. I find that odd because contained within the speech itself, it states that it has not been the intention of this government “to touch on every conceivable base or to announce every measure that we will undertake in our mandate. Rather, it is an initial agenda....”

I think it has to be seen as an initial agenda to get this province moving.

The common ground, I think, is there for each of us to build on. We recognize that opposition certainly has its role to play with the government, but we also recognize that when we look at concerns around the environment, integrity in government, when we look at the whole question of whether or not many in our communities will be able to maintain their standard of living or will be able to have a job to go to tomorrow, we understand that in fact we have to build that common ground in order to resolve some of those problems.

I believe that we have some of the answers. I do not think we have all the answers. I do not think there is any quick fix or any Band Aid solution to many of the problems that exist out there, but at least for once I believe that the residents of Ontario are going to have a government that is not only concerned but that genuinely cares, and a government, for once, that is prepared to listen.

Finally, Mr Speaker, it has been stated that An Agenda for People will really be the acid test of this government come 1994 or 1995. I want to tell you, I welcome that. I am sure it is not going to be 1993, by the way. But I welcome that to be the test of this government. I am certainly not backing away from that. I hope my colleagues, as well, will be prepared to defend that document and that we have implemented on behalf of the residents of this great province.

In conclusion, I want to say that as the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs I look forward to the challenges within the ministry, I look forward to dealing with the over 5,000 locally elected individuals who serve their communities across Ontario and, as well, I look forward to dealing with the heads of those 839 municipalities who have to work—and we have to work—in very much a co-operative effort in order to deliver the services that the residents of our province not only expect but certainly deserve.

1700

Mr Jackson: I am very pleased to be able to speak in the House today on the throne speech. Like virtually every Ontarian, I was surprised at the election of Ontario's first socialist government and I was looking forward to the throne speech with some trepidation, some excitement, some anticipation, not only by virtue of having debated what I thought was an outstanding NDP candidate in my riding in the election but also by virtue of the relationships that I had over the six years with my friends in the New Democratic Party who sat adjacent to me in opposition for so many years. I had a particularly close relationship with the former member for Scarborough West and the former member for Riverdale, with whom I shared an interest in and a devotion to social policy issues.

It is within that context that as I read the throne speech and I look at the subsequent announcements of this government in the ensuing period, I have some serious concerns. The initial, first day's reading of this throne speech means one thing to a lot of people, but now some two weeks after the throne speech, based on a series of

announcements, it is clear that this throne speech should be reviewed and revisited to see the real context in which it is being presented.

I think there are three themes that did not really come out in the first reading of the throne speech, but I think on returning to it, these themes can be drawn out very clearly. One of them is this thought process or this mentality, a them-versus-us mentality on the part of this government, almost as if it has a bit of a chip on its shoulder before it even gets out of the blocks with its responsibility to govern in this province. Clearly it says that they are "a group of people accustomed to being on the outside of established power structures" and "my government will open Queen's Park to those who have never before had an effective voice in the corridors of power." Yet when we ask what that means, we cannot get a clear statement from the Premier on who he is talking about. One would assume that we were talking about vulnerable adults. Clearly that is a group of our citizens. Maybe another group would be children, because we do not have mental health legislation that covers children. In fact children should have a voice in the corridors of power.

Yet we do not see, in terms of policy statements coming from the throne speech, a clear commitment. Certainly the actions of the government would betray that there may be a whole set of other people who are getting access to power for the first time. It was only last week that I raised the issue of the unusual and untoward influence that the president of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union had with the Minister of Community and Social Services, and yet vulnerable adults were not allowed to be party to that decision. They were not even given the courtesy of being invited in to discuss the implications of hijacking a major commitment to deinstitutionalization.

To parallel this, we have a Provincial Auditor's report that shows that many of our vulnerable adults are today at risk in these institutions, that we have been documenting this for over a year and a half, and yet it is possible to read in this throne speech that maybe it was OPSEU that has been denied access to the corridors of power. It might be interesting to find out if there is within cabinet a policy-vetting framework—which is not unaccustomed for cabinets all across North America—that deals specifically with the interests of OPSEU before any legislation becomes public.

I think that begs the other side of the coin, that in the process of giving additional access to power, there is the reciprocal: Who loses some of that power? Whose interests are less served? I think the government would be wise to put in perspective, before it gets too entrenched in its belief in its own Agenda for People, that this simple document will sustain it for four years, and not that these actions which, because of opposition, the media and the spirit of the very people who are vulnerable, that this message does become public and ultimately the government will be measured by its response.

I think another theme in this throne speech was this theme of, "That was then and this is now," as though things that happened as late as August, the election commitments, well, that was fine. That was in the context of a

heated election, sort of like pre-orgasmic thrashing of politicians promising everything to get votes. The truth is that people in good faith went to the ballot box with a belief in individuals, backbenchers, government members, cabinet ministers. They put their faith in those individuals to come forward with the solid proposals that would give them the relief they sought, the dignity they deserved.

So I remind the government members that when they read this throne speech, they cannot embrace the notion, "That was then and this is now." Of course, the final theme is, "Be patient, don't worry." I find it hard to believe that having waited all these years, with the social conscience of the leader of the third party, then Leader of the Opposition and now, today, Premier, he can actually make the statement: "Be patient. It's going to take time."

There should be priorities for this government and they should be clearly enunciated. The priorities did not appear in this throne speech in the areas that we heard on the streets as we knocked on door after door. What were those priorities? Health care. The only line we got on health care was that money was not the answer. Imagine, money is not the answer—as if, after all these years of planning for health care, that is what they can come up with.

In social services, we are told we have to be patient because there are going to be structural changes. "We're attacking structural changes." I have news for the members: The only structural changes the government has come up with are it has fast-tracked a nuclear plant and it has allowed a foreign company to come in and buy Consumers' Gas. Those are the structural changes the government has made to this province. But have they made the structural changes that have been required to give access to disabled people to continue with the progress of deinstitutionalization, to give dignity to adults who have been our most vulnerable?

Education: not a dollar in education, not a hope for education. Not a prayer for health care and not a word for business. Those are the three things that are in this throne speech which are reason for concern. We saw rent control legislation. I voted with the NDP against the rent control bill in this House five years ago. I did so because I knew then it was a bankrupt bill, and that party has known for years that it was wrong. What do they do? They come in and they freeze it down.

I want the members to know that the rich tenants in my riding are delighted with the Premier. They are delighted they are going to be able to spend six months in Florida and their rents will stay cheap in Burlington while they are down there. I voted against that bill because we need a shelter subsidy that recognizes true need. That was mentioned in the Social Assistance Review Committee report; that was mentioned in the Stuart Thom report. I cannot abide the ideological view that we have to have universal subsidy for the rich under rent control.

Every time we give something to someone who does not need it in this province, there is that much less to give to those who are less fortunate, and the list is growing. The truth is that the government's commitment to job improvement in this throne speech is for \$700 million for capital improvements. These are major corporations which are

going to be out building roads, major capital works where the moneys are not going specifically into the workers' pockets but would, for example, by the removal of almost \$1 billion in capital improvements. Renovations: We have a carpet company in this province that is going under, and 30% of all accommodation or apartment units in this province will, in many cases, be doing without additional carpet because those renovations have been halted.

The truth is that there is some good news in this throne speech. I would be remiss if I did not mention it, and unless the members want to interject, I would like to get it on the record. The truth of the matter is that it does not take, as I have been lectured by a member of cabinet, 11 feminists in the Premier's cabinet in order to establish some badly need changes in this province for women. The truth of the matter is that all three political parties are committed to that and I want to acknowledge publicly my support for the Attorney General and his commitment to women, especially as it relates to violence and abuse. The members who are veterans know of my interest in that support for those initiatives. I applaud the government.

I simply want to say in closing that I am disappointed that the Agenda for People has become an agenda for election victory only. With all members, I wait in anticipation to see how many more people in this province are disappointed by the failure to implement certain elements of the Agenda for People.

1710

Mr Conway: I want to say that it is a pleasure to join this debate as it winds down. I think we are taking the vote later this afternoon. I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity today to join in the debate after my friends the member for Lanark-Renfrew and the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry have both participated in the debate. I certainly enjoyed their remarks very much indeed.

I guess I should, like all other members, begin my remarks by thanking the good voters of Renfrew North for sending me to this place on the sixth occasion. In the tradition of these speeches, I want to thank them most heartily for their renewed vote of confidence in me as their member.

Obviously, I want to welcome all the new and returning members and in so doing, like a lot of the veterans around here, observe that this is a very different place. I am excited to see so many new and vibrant people in the chamber. In making that observation, of course, I would also have to reflect upon some of the people who are not here. I was glad, for example, to hear my friend the member for Wellington talk about the contribution of one of the best members I have known in my 15 years, Jack Johnson, who served here and served with me in a number of capacities over those 15 years. Certainly, Marion Bryden. I do not know if anyone mentioned Marion, but Marion soldiered through long, long years of opposition. I think of people like Jim McGuigan, Gordie Miller from our side, people who are not here any longer but who certainly made a very considerable contribution.

I want to begin my remarks by reflecting on two or three aspects of the recent campaign, the Ontario election of 1990, which, as has been observed, I think, by many of the previous speakers, was quite a dramatic turn of events, a surprising election in many ways, significant to be sure. When one looks at the returns on a province-wide basis, one sees things that we have not seen in Ontario before. I want, in making those observations, to congratulate in a very direct and personal way the New Democratic Party and especially the Premier. I say this most personally because I have watched the Premier since he arrived here in 1982. We are almost at his eighth anniversary, I think. Over the last two or three years it has not been easy. I do not think it is any secret that at a personal level, the leader of the government has gone through some very difficult times. To soldier in those times as he did stoically—

Mr Nixon: With a lot of disagreeable colleagues.

Mr Conway: As my friend the member for Brant-Haldimand says, he soldiered through those last couple of years not only with an evident strain in his personal life—those members who do not know about his brother's passing will recall that he had some very difficult moments. I certainly share with him the sense of accomplishment he must now feel, because he made an enormous contribution. It is no secret that the former member for Oshawa and the former member for Scarborough West on occasion could, in those years of opposition, make his time as leader of the party not easy. I say again, I in a very personal way want to congratulate him for the victory which, in large measure, was his. I know that my friends opposite would join me in that.

It is always an important and exciting time when governments change in a democratic society. I cannot share, but I can appreciate the feeling of exhilaration and excitement that must have been felt and that is surely still being felt by my honourable friends opposite. It is important to have these changes, however difficult and painful it might be for some of us on these occasions, for a variety of reasons, not the least of those reasons being for the party system itself. One perhaps would not say this, but one would think this: You join in party movements with the expectation that some day you are going to be favoured with the responsibility of office. I thought of how important it must have been on the night of 6 September for people like Ted Jolliffe or Donald MacDonald or Stephen Lewis. I think of Donald MacDonald most especially, someone I have known for a long time and someone I respect greatly, how he must have felt to have, at age 78, finally seen a day he worked so long and hard for.

I say again that it is, I think, an important day for our party system and for society generally when we see this kind of change in a democratic society. My friends to the left, the Tory party, came through the campaign with a certain sense of renewal. As one of the previous speakers indicated this afternoon, some 50% of this caucus is new. I have met a number of the members. Certainly they appear to be a spirited and lively group, and I am sure they are going to enjoy their five years here. The new leader of that party has come through his first electoral contest in, I

think, an adequate position. I do not want to put the member for London North on the spot in that regard, but certainly the Tory party, with a substantial number of new members, can take some pleasure from the result.

What can one say about ourselves? Let me say it, because I have been here longer than just about anyone other than my friend the member for Brant-Haldimand. This was not the election result we had planned for. It has been said by others that this was a clear defeat for the Liberal Party. I think all of the post-election analysis makes plain that what we had on the night of 6 September was a government defeated, not a government elected, and I do not say that in any critical way of my friends opposite. I think we as a party are going to have to reflect very seriously upon the events that led up to the date of 6 September. A very strong and clear message was delivered to us, and I am sure it will be understood and addressed.

Having said all of that, I think the record will show that the Peterson administration in this province will stand very tall in the history of Ontario. I want to say a word about someone with whom I shared 15 years in the Legislature. For the last eight or nine of those years, David Peterson and I were seatmates together. He served, as I indicated, for some 15 years in this place. He led the Ontario Liberal Party out of long years of opposition—I think it was 42 years altogether in opposition—to its first experience in government in almost half a century. He changed and he changed significantly the public life of Ontario. He gave new direction and new emphasis to critical policy areas like education, health care, the environment, language and multicultural policy, to name but four or five. For this and much more, we thank him; and for this and much, much more, he will long be remembered by the people of Ontario and certainly by the members of this party.

I want to say some other things about the Ontario election of 1990 which, as I indicated, was my sixth campaign in this province. In the Ottawa Valley we had quite a remarkable campaign. The weather was good. I was favoured with four very fine opponents who soldiered very effectively and pointed out to the electors of Renfrew North the several deficiencies of the incumbent. We had all in all quite a good campaign. I really enjoyed it as one of the best I have experienced in 15 years. When I travelled in the mid- to later part of the campaign out of the Ottawa Valley into parts of eastern and central Ontario, I began to encounter a reality rather different than the one I had been accustomed to since the early part of August 1990.

I want to make a couple of observations, one of which has to do with my own experience as a candidate in north Renfrew. That was what I will call the COR phenomenon. We had in our constituency, and I know many of you—most of you, probably—had the same, an interesting election in that new parties developed. In my part of eastern Ontario, the new party was the COR party, the Confederation of Regions party. The other parties—and we have had the Family Coalition Party for some time—all had their conventions in July and August. I think we had about 80 at ours, the NDP had about 60 at its, the Family Coalition had a relatively small number, the Conservative Party had 40 or 50, but the COR party had 450 people to a nomination in

Pembroke in early August. It clearly was the dynamic event locally in the campaign.

1720

If I were being fair, I would have to say that the COR party's campaign was a very significant part of the election, and in fact on election night the COR party pulled 5,600 votes and got 18% of the vote cast. That was a dramatic departure from anything we had experienced previously. I take very seriously what the voters of Renfrew said. I know my friend the member for Lanark-Renfrew and certainly my colleague the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry experienced similar COR results. It cannot be put any other way than to say that the COR vote was a profound and passionate protest about a number of the language and constitutional positions being advanced by, shall I say it, certainly the Liberal Party, but the main-line parties, if I am being honest—a profound and passionate protest.

I would go to campaign meetings, to all-candidates meetings, and I would meet the COR delegation there by the score, in some cases more than 100 people, more than 60 in many cases, and in some cases shaking with rage about what government and the old-line parties had done: 5,600 votes, 18%. It was, for me, a very real education. In my own home poll in the east end of Pembroke, which would be taken by many of the members as a very typical middle-class suburb, I think my vote was 120; the COR candidate got 90. It was very interesting who was protesting and why. I think those of us from the old-line parties, if I can sound like Réal Caouette for a moment, will have to take stock of some of that protest. I certainly do not mean to suggest for one moment that we ought to accede to some of it, but I learned something in the summer of 1990. Not all of it was very pleasant, not all of it was very happy, but I certainly intend to at least take some stock of what I heard and what I saw.

I just want to quickly touch on some of this phenomenon. In Lanark-Renfrew the COR party got 3,000 votes. In Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry it was 3,500. In Sudbury it was 5,400; Sudbury East 3,700; in Nickel Belt 2,800; in Cornwall 4,600. Then, of course, in much of the rest of the province we saw another not new party, but the Family Coalition Party. I was struck to see, for example, that in Bruce 3,600 votes were for FCP, in Middlesex 4,000, in Lambton 3,500, in Waterloo 3,000, in Halton North 2,500, in Peterborough 3,600. In many of these cases that vote was decisive.

I noticed the other day in reading the provincial press, as I often do, the paper in Exeter, the Exeter Times-Advocate of 14 November 1990. The NDP held a seminar. I was quite struck, because a certain Harold Koehler, I think it is, says that the FCP was the best friend the NDP had in electoral terms in southwestern Ontario. I think he is right. If you look, for example, at the Middlesex result, who would ever have thought we would see a day when you could get elected to this place with 32.7% of the vote? I congratulate the new member. I know she will do a good job. But the member for Peterborough and the member for Lambton were elected here with 31% and 33% of the vote.

The interesting thing about many of these results is the decisive factor. In the case of many of these results, the FCP—I think we would all admit privately and perhaps even publicly—would not embrace a lot of what the NDP stands for; in fact, I think you could argue that the NDP would probably represent anathema in the minds of many in the FCP. Yet there is no question that the FCP was absolutely decisive in this election in many ridings, particularly across southwestern Ontario. I am not complaining about that. I am just observing that in 1990, for example, 37.6% was enough to elect a comfortable majority government. Five years ago, Frank Miller was thrown out of office having commanded 37% of the vote.

In my more mischievous moments, I imagine that one of these days a dispassionate observer of the Ontario scene, someone like Desmond Morton, is going to rush into print with an essay saying how antidemocratic it is that 37.6% can give you a comfortable majority government. It was in that respect a very, very interesting election.

I want to say as well a couple of other things having to do with the election, one of which has to do with the role of the special interests. Now, we saw in this regard, I think, some new developments in an old game. I have been around politics for most of my adult life—which is not very long, as my friend the member for Brant-Haldimand might observe—and over the course of several campaigns I have seen lobby groups and special interest groups participate before, but I have never seen anything quite like what I saw this time.

Who will ever forget that day in early August when the doctors, the teachers and OPSEU got together to form the great coalition? Who among us will forget some of the tactics and some of the advertising engaged in by those special interests? I must say the result of 6 September will undoubtedly make many of those special interests feel vindicated, and I suspect they will be emboldened.

I can say only that my friends at the Commission on Election Finances—the current chairman, who has talked and worried aloud about what we are going to do about third party participation, third party advertising—have been given a new diet on which to feed for the next few months.

I suppose the good thing, however, about the special interests is this: The wheel has finally come full circle. Gone will be the day, I am sorry to say, when election party platforms will be simply larded up with all of the special requests of the special interests, held up as something for the commonweal. That is perhaps a very significant long-term benefit, though I suspect that for the next few years my honourable friends opposite will anguish over that which was committed in the summer of 1990.

I want to say a final word about the campaign, and that has to do with the advertising. I simply want to say this: I will never forget that night in August when I came in off the trail and saw that television ad from the New Democratic Party, the ad with the television news, the ad that impugned the integrity of the then current administration. I was really taken aback, because I thought, "This

from the party of Woodsworth, Jolliffe, MacDonald and Stephen Lewis, this kind of ad?"

I thought for a moment I was in North Carolina or in California, and I am not being funny. I have to believe that over there there is—somebody earlier talked about one of the finest members ever to serve here, Jim Renwick. I knew him well. I will tell members, that ad and the spirit which informed it I think is a sad discount on the legacy of a great party, a party which has always held itself to be better than the rest.

When I think back 15 years ago to the speeches that Stephen Lewis would give and the lectures that Donald MacDonald gave about integrity in politics, honesty in politics, and I saw an ad that reminded me more of Jesse Helms than J. S. Woodsworth, I began to realize that it was in fact a new day.

1730

But we have a new day. I must say we have a new government, a newly democratic government. I am happy to see the leader of the government here, because in the last three or four days I have had the occasion to hear him on one radio interview, and last night, to my surprise, I heard him on Angelo Perschilli's MCTV interview, I think it was—channel 47. I could not see him on Friday morning but I did hear him.

I saw him last night and I was struck—because I have got a lot of regard for the leader of the government; he is a smart, sensible, pragmatic politician. I heard him say last night, "In opposition we said much that was rhetorically satisfying, but a lot that was not very practical." I heard him say last night, "Our job now is to do that which is possible, to do the right thing." I heard him take a tough question about what he was going to do about the Canada-US free trade deal and I saw him skate, Barbara Ann Scott-like, into the Mexican free trade deal and bury poor Angelo in a mass of verbiage that even in Italian must have been something to behold.

Well, the interview was quite fascinating. My friend was giving the interview in both Italian and English, and I do not mean anything but a compliment—I was marvelling at the honourable Premier's capacity in Italian.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: Talk about verbiage.

Mr Conway: The verbiage—well, my friend the Minister of Labour can see with his glasses what he wishes to see. I want to simply make this point, that we have a new government, that we have a new Premier who was quick to tell Peter Gzowski on Friday morning that people should not expect too much, that there were great expectations he could not fulfil. I have to say what my friend the member for Fort William said earlier this afternoon: Who created the expectations? Who made the specific commitments about child care, about social housing, about environmental protection, about gas prices, about financing for health, education and social services?

My friends will be judged in these and other matters by their standard, the standard they have set. Those of us who are in other parties have always marvelled at the view the New Democrats have had that they are a different party.

I see my friends the Solicitor General and the Minister of Mines sitting side by side. I remember back a couple of years ago, not even two years ago, when certain contentious social policies were being deliberated and they made, in one case, a beeline for the door that I can well remember.

Now I see the Minister of Health in her inimitable way make very plain the social policy of this government in key areas. I watch the members for Sault Ste Marie and Lake Nipigon and Cambridge and Essex-Kent and Sudbury, and I am impressed by the discipline of power and the rigours of office, notwithstanding the most interesting speech just offered by the member for Dovercourt.

So we will look to the new government for the fulfilment of its promises. We will judge them by the NDP standard that we know to be a better and higher standard than any other standard seen in this province.

As my friend the Premier knows, I am a fair and reasonable person. I want to say on this occasion that I, for one, intend to give this new government time and opportunity to develop in very specific detail its Agenda for People. I do not expect in the first few days or weeks that we are going to see the true colour of this new administration. I want to give this government time. I want to see that first budget. But by about next May or June, I will be tuning back into this channel to see how promise is going to be translated into performance. Like the people of Ontario, I certainly will be expecting the NDP to be as good as its their promise across the waterfront of its several and most interesting commitments.

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the opportunity to join in this debate. It is the first debate that I have fully participated in, apart from the rigours of question period, as the leader of the government. I want to begin by congratulating the movers and seconders of the throne speech. I was very moved by the presentation by the member for York East, but I also think that it is a statement of how this province has changed. I do not mean this in any partisan sense, but I just think in the sense that we now accept purely as a matter of fact that two interpreters are here, very much a part of our enlarged family. I think it has been an opportunity for all of us to recognize just how far we have still to go as a province to make sure that all of our institutions are accessible to all the people of the province.

I have had an opportunity to listen to the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Conservative Party. I heard them while I was in the House. I did not have an opportunity to hear all the speeches that have been made by members from all sides, but I have read a great many of them and I have had a chance to listen to some of them on television in my office.

Mr Elston: He wrote a number of them.

Hon Mr Rae: The member for Bruce says that I wrote several of them. He knows better than to say that. My own speeches are not even written down so how could I write anybody else's? But sometimes it would be better, perhaps, if they were.

I heard the member for Renfrew North speaking with great eloquence and in fact it was partly in response to that

eloquence that I decided to get into the House as quickly as I could from a cabinet committee. I understand he is now going on a six- or seven-month extended vacation whereby he is going to give the government a chance to do its job, and then he will come back in May or June and revisit us on that occasion. I look forward to seeing him on his return when he comes back to judge us, as he puts it.

I want to say to him and to all the members of the House that I think question period is an opportunity for us to be held accountable on a daily basis. It is one of many ways in which governments are held accountable by opposition parties. The standard he seemed to be setting was saying that he wanted us to carry out every one of the commitments we made during the election and that he wanted to make sure we were going to do it by May or June. I would suspect that if we were to do that, he would be the first to criticize us for doing the things he disagrees with. So I say to him and I say to the members of the opposition parties that we think we signalled in the throne speech what it is we are going to try to do as a government and the kinds of changes that are going to be required to make a difference in this province.

I think it is fair to say that the extent of the difficult economic circumstances in which we find ourselves troubles all of us. There is not a member in this House who has not had to face constituents who have been laid off, unemployed, who are facing a very difficult time because of the economy in which we now find ourselves. Of course, as we have said on other occasions, the recession and the economic downturn we are experiencing, which has been very sudden and dramatic in its impact on revenues and dramatic in its impact on people, is something which has two major effects on us as politicians.

1740

First, its major effect is that it dramatically changes the communities in which we are all living. It is important for us to remember that the first thing a recession does, apart from affecting municipalities and provinces and the federal government, is that it affects people. It affects communities and it affects the community's ability to provide hope and to provide jobs and to provide a sense of the future to many people who are less secure than they were just a few months ago in terms of their thinking.

That is why I was very proud of the fact that one of the first things the Treasurer did when he took on his responsibilities and one of the first things we as a government did when we took on our responsibilities was to say that we were going to take the steps that would, in the short term, help very substantially those communities that have been affected by the recession.

We have already been criticized by some in the opposition. The opposition parties, the two wings we encounter on a daily basis, really have at least two voices. The first voice is Dr Spend. Dr Spend is somebody who comes out and says: "You said you were going to do this and now you should do it. You shouldn't do it today, you should have done it yesterday. You shouldn't have done it yesterday, you should have done it four months ago or you should have done it six months ago." So we have all the Dr Spends who are out there. Everybody who has been on this

side of the House—and we now have all three parties that have, in a sense, been on this side of the House—knows the interests that are out there, that are waiting for the dollars, that are waiting for the expenditures.

All I can say is that we are doing the best we can to meet the needs of all the people of the province within the means we have. It would be irresponsible of us to do otherwise. All the members on the other side would be the very first to criticize if we were to do otherwise. So we then have Dr Save.

Dr Save has many manifestations. In fact, even in one question, you can get Dr Spend and Dr Save vying for who it is who is going to get to the mouth of the honourable member in asking a question. A first question will be Dr Spend speaking and the next question will be Dr Save speaking. The member for Burlington South was out here today. His first question was, "You didn't spend enough." That was his first question: "You said you were going to spend \$300 million and you only spent \$100 million in your first announcement. Where's the other \$200 million?" As if that is what he really wanted us to do, because the next question from the member was Dr Save. What he was saying was, "When you spent your \$100 million you ended up costing the municipalities something and you shouldn't have done that either."

We accept this criticism. We expect it. I cannot say I am mesmerized with surprise that members all got their copies of *An Agenda for People*. I cannot say that I am doubled over with shock that they have looked at the various statements and speeches I have made since 1982—in fact, even long before that—and said, "This is what you said you would do," or, "This is what you said you might do," or, "This is something that you said." The terrifying thought that one's every thought is in print is enough to make any politician wary.

But I say to all members of the House, first, that I appreciated the debate, I appreciated the contributions that have been made.

Je peux dire, en tant que chef, que je vais faire de mon mieux afin de participer à toutes les discussions dans cette Chambre, d'écouter les points de vue des députés et de faire de mon mieux, en tant que chef du gouvernement, pour répondre aux besoins de toute la province. Nous avons l'obligation de le faire. Je crois qu'il serait irresponsable de faire autrement que d'offrir notre bon jugement et d'exercer notre bon jugement pour le bien-être de la province.

I just want to say one last thing. It was Edmund Burke, who was not a member of a tradition of which I am particularly a member, who said just about 200 years ago, speaking to the electors of Bristol, that while they might disagree with him, he was elected to provide his good judgement. And so I say to all the members of the House that we are trying to provide enough information so that we can all exercise our good judgement. That is what we are trying to do as members on this side of the House. We have a reform agenda which we are trying to carry out in difficult circumstances, and that is precisely what we intend to do. We will do so in a spirit of fair play, in a spirit

of wanting to listen, in a spirit of wanting to learn and in a spirit of wanting to lead.

The Speaker: On Wednesday 21 November 1990, Mr Malkowski moved, seconded by Mrs Mathysen, that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

"To the Honourable Lincoln M. Alexander, a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, Knight of Grace of the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law, bachelor of arts, doctor of laws, colonel in Her Majesty's armed forces supplementary reserve, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us."

On Thursday 22 November 1990, Mr Nixon moved that the address in reply to the speech from the throne be amended by adding the following words—

Mr Elston: Dispense.

The Speaker: I beg the indulgence of the House. I take this to be an important occasion on which all three parties have had cause to comment. All three parties are represented in the statement, and I think it fitting that it be read in its entirety.

"This House regrets that the new government has failed to put forward a legislative agenda which deals adequately with the issues facing the province, and that this House condemns the government:

"1. for its failure to fulfil commitments made in its Agenda for People, specifically those social reforms which the new government advocated so forcefully while in opposition, such as child care, social assistance rates and legislative reforms;

"2. for its failure to respond adequately to the worsening recession, particularly the absence of any initiatives which would encourage new investment and new job opportunities for the people of Ontario;

"3. for its total failure to clearly establish policy priorities and funding commitments in such fields as the environment, health, education, agriculture and northern development."

On Monday 26 November 1990, Mr Harris moved that the amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the throne be amended by adding the following words:

"4. for its failure to commit to a policy of restraint designed to control the growth and cost of government and to reduce the tax burden on its citizens;

"5. for its failure to recognize and act on the necessity of building a new financial partnership with Ontario's municipalities;

"6. for its failure to articulate any measures to respond to the aging of Ontario's population;

"7. for its failure to advance a coherent regional development policy;

"8. for its failure to recognize the crisis facing Ontario's agricultural community and its lack of commitment to preserve farm land and provide interest rate relief for farmers."

The first question to be decided is Mr Harris's amendment to the amendment to the motion.

The House divided on Mr Harris's amendment to the amendment, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes—37

Arnott, Beer, Bradley, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Chiarelli, Conway, Cousens, Cunningham, Elston, Eves, Grandmaitre, Harnick, Harris, Jackson, Jordan, Mahoney, McClelland, McLean, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, Offer, O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Ruprecht, Sola, Sterling, Stockwell, Tilson, Turnbull, Vileuneuve, Wilson, J.

Nays—67

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren;

Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdoch, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Swarbrick, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziembra.

The House divided on Mr Nixon's amendment, which was negated on the same vote.

The House divided on Mr Malkowski's main motion, which was agreed to on the same vote reversed.

The Speaker: It is therefore resolved that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable Lincoln M. Alexander, a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, Knight of Grace of the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law, bachelor of arts, doctor of laws, colonel in Her Majesty's armed forces supplementary reserve, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

The House adjourned at 1805.

ERRATA

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
62	2299	1	21	An hon member: Is he running for the leadership?
62	2304	2	43	government before it. In fact, I just heard its leader on television yesterday; he is still blaming the Liberal

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, Chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Monday 3 December 1990

Members' statements

Bicentenary expedition	2321
Mrs McLeod	
Municipal government	2321
Mr Jordan	
Tributes	2321
Mr Fletcher	
Transportation in Mississauga	2321
Mr Mahoney	
Waste management	2322
Mr Cousens	
Illiteracy	2322
Mr Beer	
Forest management	2322
Mr McLean	
Fire prevention	2322
Mr Huget	

Statement by the ministry

Goods and services tax	2323
Miss Martel	

Responses

Goods and services tax	2323
Mr Miclash	
Mr Stockwell	

Oral questions

Rent review	2324
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Kwinter	
Transfer payments to municipalities	2325
Mr Nixon	
Mr Laughren	
Mr Phillips	
Mr Beer	
Rent review	2326
Mr Tilson	
Mr Cooke	
Mr Harris	
Automobile insurance	2327
Mr Chiarelli	
Mr Rae	
Non-profit housing	2328
Mr Turnbull	
Mr Cooke	
Mr Harris	
Urban Transit Development Corp contract	2329
Mr Martin	
Mr Philip	

Day care	2329
Mrs McLeod	
Mrs Akande	
Social assistance	2330
Mr Jackson	
Mr Rae	
Occupational health and safety	2331
Mr Owens	
Mr Mackenzie	
Oak Ridges moraine	2332
Mrs Caplan	
Mr Cooke	

First readings

City of London Act, 1990, Bill Pr29	2332
Mrs Cunningham	
Agreed to	2332
City of Toronto Act, 1990, Bill Pr12	2332
Ms Churley	
Agreed to	2332

Throne speech debate

Resuming the adjourned debate	2332
Mr Chiarelli	2332
Mr Harnick	2333
Ms Wark-Martyn	2334
Mr Phillips	2335
Mr Turnbull	2336
Mr Drainville	2338
Mr Ruprecht	2339
Mr Arnott	2340
Ms Churley	2341
Mr Grandmaitre	2342
Mr Jordan	2343
Mr Silipo	2344
Mr Villeneuve	2346
Mr Ferguson	2347
Mr Jackson	2348
Mr Conway	2349
Mr Rae	2352
The Speaker	2354
Agreed to	2354

Other business

Adjournment	2354
Errata	2355

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	2356
---	------

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le lundi 3 décembre 1990

Déclaration ministérielle		Discours du trône	
La taxe sur les produits et les services 2323	Suite du débat ajourné 2332
Mlle Martel		M. Grandmaître 2342
		M. Rae 2353



64 1990

64 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 4 December 1990

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 4 décembre 1990

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 4 December 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Chiarelli: The Premier is playing possum with the people of Ontario on the issue of automobile insurance. On 10 November the Premier said, "The approach the government takes has to be based not just on pie-in-the-sky hope but a solidly based, documented approach—the decision cannot be based on ideology." Yet the Premier's cowboy minister was quoted last week as saying that the present Ontario motorist protection plan, Bill 68, is "a complete disaster." Where is the documentation to support this?

A legislative research officer reports that Ontario's three largest automobile insurance companies are complying with the guidelines restricting premiums to an average 8% in the greater Toronto area and 0% outside the Toronto area. I ask the Premier, where is his documentation on premium affordability, the root of automobile insurance reform? Will the Premier document for us his current information on premium levels in Ontario, and if he does not have this type of information, why not? I repeat, where is the Premier's documented approach and why does he not rein in his shoot-from-the-lip cowboy minister?

PUBLIC SECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE

Mrs Marland: Today the Treasurer will reveal the details of his government's throne speech promise to "allocate \$700 million for necessary maintenance and renovation of public sector facilities." But unless the Treasurer is a magician, \$700 million will not do the job. Over the next 35 years, more than \$2 billion a year will be needed for infrastructure renewal just in the greater Toronto area. According to the deputy minister for the GTA, revenues currently provide only half of the amount needed for this capital spending. Even if the Treasurer devotes the whole \$700 million to GTA infrastructure, he is proposing a \$700-million solution to a \$40-billion problem.

To make the picture clearer, consider that the 1990 budget paper E on the costs of public services shows that each kilometre of a four-lane highway costs about \$6 million to build. If we spent the whole \$700 million on a new four-lane highway, we would get only 116 kilometres of new road; 116 kilometres will not even get us across the greater Toronto area, which is 140 kilometres wide. If we included the cost of \$14 million for the average highway interchange, \$700 million would buy us just 10 interchanges and 93 kilometres of highway.

No ordinary mortal could make \$700 million solve our infrastructure problems. We are waiting to see what tricks the sorcerer and Minister of Economics has up his sleeve.

ROYAL CANADIAN LEGION, BRANCH 635

Mrs MacKinnon: Recently I had the honour of attending the official opening of the Royal Canadian Legion's newest branch, Branch 635, in the town of Brigen in my riding of Lambton county. I also had the pleasure of presenting the members with a plaque on 23 November 1990.

Historically the Royal Canadian Legion originated when several small associations of ex-soldiers banded together throughout Canada during the First World War. The first national organization, known as the Great War Veterans Association, was established in April 1917 and in 1960 was renamed the Royal Canadian Legion, as we know it today.

As I speak of the Royal Canadian Legion, many things come to mind, in particular the variety of community services it provides to our nation today, such as Remembrance Day or Poppy Day, ladies' auxiliaries, adult education services, community service projects, rehabilitation services, bursaries and fundraising campaigns.

In view of all their contributions to our community, the Royal Canadian Legion, the veterans and today's men and women serving our country deserve to be acknowledged and commended for their dedication and contribution to our country, and we should continue to provide them with united support. Once again, I am honoured to have the privilege of announcing the opening of Branch 635 in the Lambton riding.

RACE RELATIONS

Mr Curling: Many elements of the recently announced Metropolitan Toronto Police race relations policy deserve praise. I want to single out one particular example today, and I hope the Solicitor General is paying attention.

On 15 November 1990 the Metropolitan Toronto Police Commission enacted the following amendment to the bylaw governing police conduct: "Members shall not, by word, deed or gesture, conduct themselves or persuade other persons to conduct themselves, in any manner that is discriminatory towards any person because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, record of offences, age, marital status, family status, handicap, or political or religious affiliation."

The Metropolitan Toronto Police Commission, Chief Bill McCormack and, most important, members of the police force, should be applauded for implementing this landmark clause. They also deserve a great deal of credit for the consultative process that preceded this announcement and for the commitment to continue to work with all community groups.

The Solicitor General has told this House that he will conduct consultations with all affected groups before he introduces regulations governing the Police Services Act this year. I trust he will pay attention to the fine example

set by the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force and the Metropolitan Toronto Police Commission. It is vital that the landmark amendment passed by the commission be included in the provincial regulations. If the Solicitor General is not prepared to provide leadership on this issue, the least he can do is to be a good follower.

HOSPITAL EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr Arnott: A serious situation exists in the riding of Wellington that I would like to bring to the attention of this House. It pertains to the possible closure of the emergency department of Louise Marshall Hospital in the town of Mount Forest.

Because of a dispute between the hospital board and the doctors who serve this institution, four doctors have threatened to withdraw their services from the hospital's emergency department effective 1 January 1991. Such an event will have serious ramifications for the future of this hospital and the community it has served for over 80 years.

The hospital board has been in contact with the Ministry of Health to enlist its support in finding a solution to this problem. I have personally spoken and written to the Minister of Health requesting her personal intervention in seeking an end to the dispute between the board and the doctors.

Louise Marshall Hospital is a viable and important medical facility which serves not only the approximately 15,000 people of its immediate catchment area but also a tourist population in the summer and accident victims from Highway 6 in its vicinity. Its doctors, nurses and staff are hard-working, conscientious, dedicated individuals whose positions, along with the hospital's future, are now in jeopardy.

On Wednesday 5 December, tomorrow afternoon, the board of Louise Marshall Hospital is holding a special meeting in a final attempt to reach a resolution. If they are unsuccessful, the Minister of Health will have to take immediate action to avert the closure of the institution's emergency department and so avoid the very grave consequences that will result from that closure.

1340

RAIL SERVICES

Mr B. Ward: Commuters in Brantford are rejoicing at the success of the Minister of Transportation in keeping this government's commitment to restore the early morning and early evening rail service from Brantford to Toronto and back. This commitment was made to the commuters of Brantford during the election campaign, and I am pleased that the Minister of Transportation made this issue such a priority with his ministry.

Five weeks ago I met with the minister and expressed to him the concerns of Brantford's commuters. In only three weeks, the Minister of Transportation has managed to accomplish what others have failed to do in the past year. The commuters of Brantford suffered during the year, a year in which they were forced to use the already congested Highway 401 and Queen Elizabeth Way corridors, a year in which their productivity was reduced as they sat in their cars in traffic jams rather than at their workstations.

I am pleased that the Minister of Transportation has also offered to have continuing dialogue with the people of Brantford and will look into ways to continue improving the system. I want to assure the minister that the commuters and local business representatives with whom I have spoken fully support his initiative in restoring this rail service to Brantford. They are delighted that they will have the option of taking a train to work here in Toronto and are not concerned whether it has Via or GO painted on the side.

FARM LANDS

Mr Bradley: The refusal of the government review committee looking into agricultural finance to visit the Niagara Peninsula and to hear on a firsthand basis the concerns of Niagara farmers, as they relate to the somewhat dismal economic prospects facing them, represents a snub to those who have been severely impacted by free trade with the United States and by the international GATT rulings.

Those of us who have spent years attempting to preserve agricultural land in the province where favourable climatic and unique soil conditions exist, as they do in much in the tender fruit lands in north Niagara, begin to question the commitment of this government to farm land preservation when the committee, under the chairmanship of the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, who is on his way to Brussels, refuses to hold public hearings in an area where lands are under tremendous pressure for development and where financial hardship for farmers has become all too common.

I call upon the parliamentary assistant to reverse the decision denying the people of the Niagara region direct access on their own turf to his committee. The Niagara regional council and the Niagara North Federation of Agriculture, which have expressed their concerns in this matter, would certainly appreciate the same chance being afforded to farmers in our area as is being given in several other parts of the province.

Saving the farm land means saving the farmer, and the appropriate first step is to listen to their concerns.

WATER SUPPLY

Mrs Witmer: I rise today to bring a matter of the utmost importance to the residents of my riding to the attention of the Minister of the Environment and this House.

The Ministry of the Environment is currently considering an application by Laurel Springs Water Corp to undertake significant water takings in the Erbsville area for the purpose of bottling and sale. This proposal could have very serious consequences for the local residents and the environment.

Many residents, as well as the councils of the townships of Wilmot and Woolwich, the city of Waterloo and the region of Waterloo, have expressed concerns about the possible impact of such water takings on the quality and quantity of the well water that most local residents rely upon. These residents are already experiencing difficulties with their water supply and there is a possibility that

approval of this application will exacerbate their problems. Moreover, they are very concerned about the possibility of serious environmental damage being done to the Laurel Creek watershed, as well as the nearby woodlot, Schaefer's Woods.

I want the Minister of the Environment to know that I share these concerns and that I am sending her a letter requesting that she withhold approval for a permit for water taking until a complete and independent environmental impact study has been conducted. I would also urge her to undertake a thorough examination of her ministry's policy with regard to large-scale private water taking permits and the laws governing water mining and the ownership of subsurface resources.

DRINKING WATER

Mr Hope: Today I would like to comment on our government's announcement to finance the Lake Huron water pipeline for my riding. It will provide clean drinking water to the people of Wallaceburg, Dresden, Walpole Island and the townships of Chatham and Camden. Clean water is something these communities have not had for quite some time.

During the boom years, the Liberals had a generous opportunity to fully fund the same project. Now we are forced to pay double the cost, and possibly lives.

On Friday, the Minister of the Environment came through with the \$43.1 million, the project's entire 1990 cost. She also guaranteed the province would cover 75% of the cost overruns.

But we are not heroes. We are simply fulfilling a basic need. It is what we swear to do when we take a seat in this House. But when I look across the floor and stare into the eyes of those who have turned me away as a constituent, I know such guidelines have not been followed.

Today the true heroes include the Wallaceburg Citizens Coalition for Clean Water, the group a member of the Liberal Party deemed radical in its fight for a basic need. Today the true heroes are the people of these communities who wondered aloud each time they turned their taps on if the safe drinking water was there.

In light of this, we should all sit in this House today humbled and think about why we are here and what we owe each other.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Hon Mr Laughren: I am honoured to deliver to the House the first major economic statement of the newly elected government, led by this Premier.

This is my first opportunity to provide a formal report to the Legislature since taking on my responsibilities as Ontario's Treasurer. I wish to assure the members that I intend to keep the Legislature informed regularly about economic conditions and the fiscal position of the government.

I would have been happier if the economic outlook today were brighter. It will come as no surprise to the people of Ontario to hear that there is a recession in this province. In fact, working people and businesses were

aware of the downturn long before the economists and the politicians started making it official.

This is not a message of doom and gloom, however. The overall fiscal position of the government of Ontario is solid. The economy of this province is one of the richest and most advanced in the world, and our workforce is one of the most highly skilled.

This government will not sit back and wait for economic forces to take their course. We believe that there are important steps we can take to stimulate job creation, to alleviate hardship among the most disadvantaged in our society and to ensure that the engine of economic growth is primed for an early recovery.

We inherited a recession and a deficit, but we did not inherit the policy paralysis that often accompanies economic hard times.

We do not believe that as a government we can spend our way out of this recession. There are too many external factors beyond our control, such as the economic performance and the conduct of monetary policies in the United States, Europe and Japan, and the continued unrest in the Middle East, to say nothing of the high-interest-rate, high-dollar policies of our own federal government.

But what we can do, we will. What we can do is pursue, through our economic initiatives, some of the broad policy goals that are central to the philosophy of the New Democratic Party government. These goals include introducing greater fairness into our institutions and practices, providing better protection for those least able to protect themselves, opening up the process of public policy development, and planning an economically and environmentally sustainable future.

In pursuing these goals, we are determined to build new partnerships. In the economic arena, it is important to note that we are firmly committed to working with key groups, such as labour, business, other levels of government and community organizations, in developing a common agenda. This agenda must support economic recovery while promoting positive and creative labour adjustment policies and industrial strategies.

We need to work together. These are complex economic times. Economies around the world are undergoing fundamental structural change because of new trade alliances, increased competition and new technologies. In Europe, the political map is being redrawn.

In Canada, there is a feeling that we have lost our collective sense of community. The government of Ontario wants to help build a national recovery agenda. Once again, we are asking the Prime Minister to bring together the first ministers of this nation to respond to the current economic challenges.

1350

We are also urging the government of Canada to join us in supporting recovery in Ontario by supplementing our own job creation initiatives.

Recent numbers have shown that the Ontario economy actually entered into a recession in April of this year. Employment generally in the province has declined by 66,000 since February. The number of unemployed workers has risen by more than one third since then, and

the unemployment rate has jumped to more than 7%. Job losses have been most marked in the goods-producing sectors, especially in manufacturing, where employment has fallen by 77,000 over the past 12 months. Bankruptcies so far this year are up 73% over last year's level.

The downturn reflects the impacts of federal high interest rates and high-dollar policies. The Bank of Canada has pursued an extremely tight monetary policy in an effort to slow growth and eliminate inflationary pressures. The results have been record-high levels of real interest rates, unprecedented spreads between Canadian and US interest rates and an appreciation of the dollar to a 12-year high of more than 88 cents US earlier this year.

These policies have undermined the ability of Canadian industry to compete internationally and have produced sharp declines in business investment and in key sectors of the Ontario economy such as manufacturing, construction and housing.

Declines in real output and employment are expected to continue well into 1991. We expect real growth of only one half of 1% in Ontario next year. For the second year in a row, there will be no net job growth. Employment in the construction sector will continue to fall as major projects are completed and few new projects are started. And the manufacturing sector will continue to be adversely affected by the recession and the free trade agreement. The unemployment rate is expected to average 7.3%.

The planned introduction of the federal goods and services tax on 1 January 1991 will extend and exacerbate the downturn. We estimate that the consumer price index inflation would remain relatively stable in 1991, at just below this year's level of 4.9%, in the absence of the GST. However, with the new tax, we estimate inflation in 1991 will actually reach about 6.1%.

Despite substantial uncertainty surrounding the economic outlook, we hope that recovery can begin by mid-1991. However, the recovery is not expected to be as strong as the one following the 1981-82 recession, as the combined effects of the GST, high real interest rates and increasing global competition continue to restrain economic growth.

The timing and the pace of the eventual recovery will depend critically on events external to the provincial economy, including US economic performance, developments in Europe and Japan especially as they affect world interest rates, the course of oil prices and federal interest rate and exchange rate policies.

The international environment is more precarious than it has been for some time. Even in the absence of war, uncertainty over developments in the Middle East continues to undermine the confidence of consumers and investors in both Canada and the United States. Any further erosion of confidence will make it more difficult for the economy to recover in the latter half of 1991.

However, a negotiated settlement in the Middle East and an easing of tension could reduce uncertainty, boost confidence, lower oil prices and speed up the eventual economic recovery.

The prospects ahead are uncertain at best. Based on current indicators, we are projecting slow growth, rising

unemployment and rising inflation due to the GST and are hoping for the beginnings of a modest recovery at midyear. Further details on Ontario's economic outlook are presented in a separate staff paper which has been distributed to members with this statement.

As I have mentioned, a return to strong and sustained economic growth will depend to a large degree on improved economic conditions beyond our borders. However, we can take measures to ensure that we are fully ready to benefit from and participate in economic recovery. In addition, we can alleviate some of the hardships of the recession by introducing immediate actions to create jobs.

There is considerable need for the renewal of our stock of social capital: our schools, housing, roads and bridges, universities and colleges, and our water and sewage facilities. As well, many of our public buildings and infrastructure need to be expanded, upgraded, made more energy efficient or made more accessible for the elderly and for persons with disabilities.

As we find ourselves in a recession, with major weakness in the construction sector, now is the time to undertake the renewal of our capital stock. As announced in the throne speech, the government is giving the go-ahead to a significant renewal of public infrastructure with a commitment from the province of \$700 million.

This short-term capital projects initiative is expected to generate the equivalent of approximately 14,000 full-year jobs. However, by the very nature of the program, a much larger number of people will benefit through employment opportunities for periods of less than one year.

Our school boards and municipalities will be important partners in this initiative. In consultation with all ministries, a large inventory of short-term capital projects has been developed. Many of the projects in the inventory have been requested in the past by local governments and school boards but were not undertaken because provincial funding was not available. Today's commitment will allow much of this backlog to go ahead. As a result of the provincial-local partnership, it is expected that our special allocation will create up to \$1 billion in short-term capital projects. All of these projects will begin to create jobs within six months, with completion before the end of the next fiscal year. Many projects will begin to create jobs almost immediately.

The employment impact of this major initiative will be felt at the very time when the economy most needs the stimulus. It will create modest growth in an economy that might otherwise be stalled at no growth. And while it is forecast to bring the unemployment rate down only by 0.2%, it will make a significant difference in the lives of many thousands of Ontario citizens. That is an impact that does not show up in macroeconomic statistics, but it is real and it is important.

The infrastructure renewal program will have important longer-term benefits. It will prolong the life of our public capital stock, it will avoid more costly reconstruction requirements in future and it will, in many cases, reduce future operating costs.

The current inventory consists of almost 3,000 projects throughout the province. These projects represent the full range of public activities and involve significant priority areas, such as the environment, roads, rehabilitation of water and sewage facilities, public and non-profit housing, community and educational facilities, retrofitting for access for disabled persons, improved fire safety, greater energy efficiency and improvements to waste sites, water-courses and forest management activities.

We will give priority to projects in communities and regions experiencing serious economic problems. Special efforts will be made to make job opportunities or apprenticeship positions available to all parts of the community, particularly women and natives.

To begin to create jobs immediately, \$41 million has been approved for projects that can be started very soon. These projects, which are the direct responsibility of provincial ministries, can be undertaken in spite of winter conditions and do not depend on other partners for activation.

Included in these immediate actions are improvements to access for disabled persons and seniors to community facilities, electrical generating facilities in several native communities, upgrading waste disposal sites on crown lands, enhancing tourism attractions at such sites as Upper Canada Village and Huronia historical parks.

We will finalize the allocation of the province's \$700-million commitment in the near future. Further announcements will take place as soon as final decisions have been made.

In addition to the direct spending I have already outlined, the government will undertake a number of tax-based initiatives.

The federal government's GST proposals could not have come at a worse time. It is expected that the GST will reduce consumers' 1991 real disposable incomes by at least \$4 billion nationally. This blow to consumers' incomes can be expected to reinforce the decline in consumer spending already set in motion by high interest rates, declining employment and sagging consumer confidence.

As I announced on 11 October, this government will not tax the GST. Amendments to the Retail Sales Tax Act were tabled on 20 November by my colleague the Minister of Revenue to ensure that if the federal government's proposed GST does in fact become a reality, Ontario's sales tax will not be piggybacked on top of it. The government also introduced in that bill a series of administrative adjustments to its retail sales tax policy that will only take effect if the GST is introduced.

Our decision not to tax the GST will save Ontario consumers an estimated \$70 million in this fiscal year. In 1991-92, the action provides \$500 million in savings to Ontario consumers.

1400

The government will introduce legislation to enrich the Ontario tax reduction for low-income Ontarians. This action, proposed originally by the previous government, cuts personal income taxes for low-income families with children and disabled dependants by an estimated \$44 million this fiscal year. Making further improvements to the

tax system's treatment of lower-income Ontarians will be an area for early action by this government.

Providing a stable climate for business planning and investment is also an important objective in good times or bad. A number of corporate tax measures have created uncertainty because proposed legislation had not been passed prior to the election. Changes announced by the previous government, some dating back to the 1988 Ontario budget, have served as the basis for business decisions and tax returns. I do not believe it would be fair or appropriate to change those tax rules retroactively.

The government therefore has decided to proceed with the outstanding legislation, including the research and development super allowance, the Ontario current cost adjustment—OCCA—and the enrichment in the OCCA rate to 30%.

The OCCA will provide additional support for investment in manufacturing and pollution control machinery and equipment by the manufacturing sector—the sector hardest hit by the recession. While I believe that the OCCA has a useful role to play in stimulating investment during the recession, it is not clear that it provides the most cost-effective or strategic incentives necessary for our long-term economic wellbeing.

Consistent with our goal of stimulating the economy in 1991, the OCCA enrichment will be available for new manufacturing machinery and equipment purchased between 1 January 1991 and 1 January 1992. In keeping with my intention of reducing uncertainty through open planning, I am announcing today that the government intends to sunset the OCCA on new manufacturing machinery and equipment. However, given the continuing need to ensure that new production processes are adopted to reduce pollution, the OCCA for pollution control equipment will stay in place indefinitely.

The OCCA will provide an estimated \$160 million in tax-based support for business investments in manufacturing and pollution control equipment in Ontario.

In total, these tax changes will deliver \$700 million in tax support to Ontario's people and businesses in 1991. We estimate that this support will add 0.2 percentage points to the 1991 provincial real growth rate and preserve or create up to 8,000 Ontario jobs.

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent at this point. As the time is running down, I would ask for consent that we allow the Treasurer to finish his statement and then extend extra time to both opposition parties for responses.

The Speaker: Agreed?

Agreed to.

Hon Mr Laughren: I appreciate the compliance of the members of the opposition.

I would now like to provide an interim update on the province's finances for the current fiscal year. As members know, on 11 October I disclosed that the \$23-million surplus projected by the previous government had deteriorated to a projected deficit of \$2.5 billion. This sharp turnaround reflected both the impact of the recession on provincial spending and revenue, and a number

of significant obligations that had not been included in the estimates tabled by the previous government.

In respect of revenues for the current fiscal year, it appears that federal transfers of Ontario personal income tax will be higher than expected. However, trends in corporate and retail sales tax revenues may offset much of this gain. On the expenditure side, the case load of social assistance recipients is expected to exceed our recent estimates at a cost of a further \$150 million this year. In addition, part of the cost of new initiatives announced today will affect spending this year.

In spite of the continuing impact of recessionary pressures, the government expects to hold the deficit to within the projected \$2.5 billion.

These are volatile and uncertain economic times. I will be providing members with a more detailed breakdown of the current-year fiscal position in the quarterly Ontario Finances report in January, when I expect to have firmer figures.

Our projected fiscal position for 1991-92 is difficult to predict in the current economic climate. However, we will still be dealing with the significant impact of the recession on both revenues and expenditures.

Revenues will suffer from the combined effects of economic slowdown, the decision not to levy the retail sales tax on the GST, and the federal decision to cap Canada assistance plan and established programs financing transfers. This last item alone will cost the province a further \$940 million in reduced revenue in 1991-92.

On the expenditure side, we face strong public demands and rising costs at a time when anti-recessionary efforts must also be put in the forefront. Funding should and will be set aside next year to undertake needed improvements and reforms as outlined in the recent throne speech. But in developing our budget for next spring, we must also take into account the size of the deficit. I remain acutely aware of the difficulty of increasing revenue during a recession, yet I cannot forget the urgent social and economic agenda facing the province. I can assure the members of this House that my deliberations concerning the budget will balance these competing pressures.

I realize that our transfer partners are anxious to hear about their funding for the coming year. The practice in Ontario has been to announce in November or early December the amount of funding available in the upcoming fiscal year for transfer partners such as hospitals, schools and municipalities. With the change in government, our funding allocations process has been somewhat delayed. To allow my colleagues and myself sufficient time to consider the funding requirements of our major transfer partners, we intend to make our announcement for funding levels early in the new year. I realize that in some cases this may delay budget planning by the boards, councils and institutions affected. However, once funding levels are established, we will expedite the process of informing municipalities, school boards, hospitals, universities and colleges of their specific grants.

Looking beyond the 1991 Ontario budget, I plan to introduce a more open, policy-driven process to review the extent to which the budget, with its taxation and

expenditure priorities, reflects the objectives of the government. I intend to examine the rationales for budget secrecy and consider innovative ways to expose the tradeoffs inherent in the budget. It is also time to consider moving towards multi-year budgeting. In addition, we plan to look at alternative ways of reporting the province's capital spending that will more clearly reflect the long-term benefits to the economy of those investments.

All of these initiatives should help to improve the budget process in Ontario.

Establishing the Fair Tax Commission is the first of many steps aimed at tapping Ontario's diverse and knowledgeable constituencies for their insights and advice. I will provide a detailed report on the establishment of the Fair Tax Commission in the near future.

In conclusion, as I noted at the outset, we are in a recession of uncertain duration. International events and unduly restrictive federal monetary policy are adding significant risks to the economic outlook. I sincerely hope the federal government will respond positively to the Premier's suggestion for a federal-provincial meeting on the economy and will join us in responding to this recession. Governments in Canada have to make co-operative and concerted efforts in dealing with the recession and in preparing for recovery.

The government sees a role for all parts of our society in successfully overcoming the current recession and in laying the foundations for a strong recovery and a more secure, resilient economy. It is our firm intention to develop close working relationships with all key groups in the community. I will be conferring closely with my cabinet colleagues and members of this House to establish the necessary framework and forums for government, labour, business and our many diverse communities to join together in addressing the challenges of economic adjustment and restructuring.

The measures I have outlined today are both progressive and responsible. In total, they provide \$1.4 billion to create jobs, stimulate investment and offset some of the negative impact of the proposed GST. Taken together, I expect that these measures will increase the provincial gross domestic product by 0.6% and create more than 20,000 jobs.

The Speaker: The clock indicated that the Treasurer went an additional three minutes beyond the normal 20 allotted. What I would like to do is add three minutes to each of the opposition parties in addition to the five which they are allocated under the rules, so that both parties have a total of eight minutes at their disposal for responses.

1410

RESPONSES

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Mr Bradley: It is most interesting, first of all, to note the change in the sides of the House, and how it changes what flows from the mouths of individual members who sit in the Legislative Assembly. One can recall with some interest, just short months ago, the gentleman who is now the Treasurer of Ontario and the Premier excluding the

external forces that affected the province and, of course, pointing the finger at the government of Ontario as being responsible for all that happened economically in this province and having within its hands the opportunity to ensure that the provincial economy was moving at the right pace. It has changed now, as the Treasurer has indicated, in reading the words that were prepared for him. In fact, the Middle East, Japan, Europe, all of the world, the United States, the other provinces, all happen to have an influence on the provincial economy. That, to a certain extent, is true.

But we want to ensure that the province takes on its responsibilities in dealing with matters within its jurisdiction, and that is what the opposition will be watching for in the next several months. We are assured, and perhaps we can be pleased to a certain extent, by the fact that perhaps we will not have a GST in Canada because, as I recall, just a few weeks ago and a few months ago, the Premier of this province was going to lead a crusade against the GST. We can be assured as well that the effects of free trade are unlikely to impact upon Ontario because, once again, the Premier of the province, a few weeks ago and a few months ago, indicated that he would be implementing measures designed to block the implementation of free trade in Ontario. So perhaps there is some assurance in those who believe that the Premier will be able to undertake those activities and be successful.

In addition to this, I find it interesting and I guess, from a politician's point of view, one can be a bit admiring of the government's being able to use the projected \$2.5-billion deficit in the province of Ontario which it inherited. One forgets that when the party that used to sit over there just a few months ago came into office, in fact the provincial deficit was \$2.6 billion and there had been a series of deficits previous to that, so this is not a unique situation. It did not impede the government in carrying out its programs, but the Treasurer and his Premier have been quite successful in getting that message across and I must say I admire them in this honeymoon period in being able to do so.

I note as well with some interest that this new government will be maintaining some of the tax changes proposed by the previous government. Despite the rhetoric during the election campaign that indeed it was going to change these measures which were designed to improve the business atmosphere in the community known as Ontario, we see that in fact the government is going to continue to implement those policies, recognizing the wisdom of them but having a difficult time explaining in the union halls of the province and other places just how it is going to be able to justify those.

To be fair to the Treasurer—and I want to be fair to him—we have a similar situation existing across the country. In fact, every province and the federal government are all revising their estimates or predictions of their budgetary revenues and their expenditures. That is to be expected in a recessionary period, but we will be looking for actions that are designed to create jobs and give an impetus to the economy.

The Treasurer has mentioned some investments in capital projects. They, of course, are extremely important. The Minister of the Environment will be particularly knowledgeable of the fact that there are a number of projects sitting on the shelf in many municipalities, and provincial projects, that could be proceeded with. In fact, a time of recession is the time to accelerate those particular projects, and we will be looking forward to those.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities put out a booklet called, I believe, *Work, Work, Work*, in which it indicated the desirability from an economic point of view of implementing infrastructure renewal in a variety of fields. I think of sewers, water projects and waste management projects, but also there are the transportation projects, such as the Pelee Island ferry which could be constructed at Port Weller Dry Docks in the city of St Catharines and take the workforce, which is at present at 30, and place it somewhere well into the hundreds. I know the Treasurer will make particular note of that and attempt to influence his cabinet colleagues to proceed with that most important project.

We recognize as well that schools in the province of Ontario always need some renewal of their buildings. There are the roofs which inevitably leak after 25 years. There are safety measures that have to be undertaken. The Ministry of the Solicitor General requires fire regulation changes. All of these can be implemented at a rather accelerated pace because they are projects that can be proceeded with quickly. We will be watching carefully to see, in each and every municipality, that the government is in fact proceeding with those projects.

The minister would recognize as well the opportunity during a period of recession to get some rather good prices when tendering is going to ensure that some of the projects that might have cost more money in a boom economy can in fact be done for somewhat less. That is an advantage again of proceeding with those kinds of projects.

In regard to the deficit, I can well recall when we were in government that at the beginning of the year all of the ministries would come in with the wish list. I suspect they have been in to the Treasurer with the wish list and appear to have convinced him, in many cases, that all of the projects should proceed. But he would recognize, as our government did, that the deficit was always going to be \$8 billion or 10 billion if he proceeded with the wish list of all of them.

The Management Board of Cabinet and the policy and priorities board of cabinet will have to look carefully, establish priorities and disappoint some people in the community by not proceeding with certain of the projects that they would like, particularly those which have long-term economic ramifications in terms of operating costs for the province.

I think if the government is going to move in the field of capital investment at this time, it is going to have to be much more productive than getting involved in longer-term programs that it may wish to initiate, and in fact will initiate, when the economy returns to what we hope will be something closer to normal.

We also recognize that had they decided to cut the sales tax in Ontario by one percentage point, they would have put back some \$1.1 billion into the hands of consumers in the province at this time of recession. They seem to have conceded the fact that the GST is going to be implemented instead of fighting it, as we had expected. But with that one gesture on the part of the Treasurer, consumers across Ontario would have been generating the kind of economic activity which would have produced even more jobs in this province.

Mr Stockwell: The last time we were in this House outlining a financial proposal such as this, we had a \$30-million surplus and we were recession-proof. I hope this particular outline is a little more accurate.

My first concern is, why is there still no mention of transfer payments? That is a large concern for a lot of operations in this province. They are still waiting for the concerns about whether or not they are going to be funded, to what extent they are going to be funded, and of course I think within the near future it should be announced. It has been reasonable that they have announced it in the past.

They are partners in this operation, the people that the Treasurer is transferring moneys to, and if in fact they are partners, using his terminology, I think they should know what their share is. We apparently have a \$1.4-billion commitment here today. We should also remember that part of that money—I believe at least \$300 million—is coming from other levels of government, particularly a kick-in from the municipalities, to kick that up to \$1 billion from the original \$700 million announcement. The Treasurer is shaking his head. “We can look into it.”

He can look into the economic outlook that we have that is not doom and gloom. It is certainly not good; not good at all. In fact, we have a declining manufacturing sector. With the decline of the manufacturing sector, I hope we do not generate new revenue by simply increasing the tax portion. I do not think that would help anybody at this point in time.

If we admit that the manufacturing sector is declining, I fear that by slapping more taxes on it, it in fact will not be around and operating by this time next year, if in fact this is the type of financial outlook that this government will have. Undercutting the manufacturer at this point in time through more taxes would simply undercut the competitiveness of those sectors. By undercutting their competitiveness, obviously there is loss of revenue to them, loss of jobs and so on.

1420

I am very disappointed about the regional strategy here today. We keep talking from the point of view that there are concerns, that there is a recession. This particular government, in *An Agenda for People*, talked about a recession back in August. They knew there was a recession. They have in fact been elected. They told us that the recession was here. So I do not know why it is taking this length of time to determine how far we are into the recession. We know it is here. They knew it was here. Why can we not see some solid proposals to fight our way out of

this recession, for the northern Ontario and eastern Ontario regions specifically?

We spoke of a partnership of players. When we talk about a partnership with the private sector and so on, maybe the Treasurer should have a meeting with the Minister of Housing, because on page 6 he says, “I do not believe it would be fair or appropriate to change tax rules retroactively.” He must not have told the Housing minister that, because he is doing everything retroactively. A little consistency would certainly help. Clearly, if they are going to forge partnerships, they are going to have to forge a better partnership than the Housing minister has forged with the landlords, which is no partnership. Speaking about it and doing it are two very different things.

From the fiscal side, the government has forgone \$500 million in revenue that would have to come from piggy-backing the sales tax with the goods and services tax, which again is laudable in my opinion, but I do not understand the hypocrisy of it when the government goes forward and still doubles the tire tax. They are continuing on along those lines, the \$40 million or so, but they do not strike it there or slash the budget there. They are giving up \$500 million. I do not think it adds up to more than a couple of hundred thousand dollars on that particular item. I do not know why they do not dispose of that as well right now. It seems to be their policy. Maybe they should be consistent right across the board.

I think we are set up for a big deficit next year. I think this is a setup. I think it will exceed the \$2.5 billion that is the deficit today. Why? I think we have stagnant growth. There is no question about that. I think 0.6% is not achievable. I do not believe we are going to achieve those kinds of numbers. It is stagnant out there. We are in a recession. It is going the wrong way. I think we are in for big trouble when it comes to the revenue side. We are losing nearly \$1 billion through established programs financing. And what does that add up to? Where do you generate the money from? I do not think the private sector today can accept any more new taxes. The Treasurer has made similar statements; it is not time to go out and tax the private sector. So how are they going to generate the shortfalls? They are going to generate the shortfalls by passing it on to the deficit and the deficit will climb from the \$2.5 billion we have today. The Treasurer has stated in the past that he is not scared at \$2.5 billion; he will be scared at \$10 billion. Where do we find that special line in between, where he starts getting scared? I think the public is very interested in that number and I think we in the Legislature are also equally interested.

Taxes are killing business today. They are killing business today because their revenues are down and their profits are down, and by continuing this tax-and-spend approach, which I think we will see next year, it is going to cut into the competitiveness of these businesses. You are going to see job losses.

I do not believe that this kind of economic outlook, although the suggestion is that it is not doom and gloom, is putting us on the road to recovery. I think we are still seeing the typical approach we have seen for the past five years, which is the tax-and-spend merry-go-round. The

only difference is that with this tax and spend, the taxpayers are paying for the government's tickets.

Mr Cousens: I would like to just carry on where the member for Etobicoke West left off. Whom do you believe? We know we could not believe the Liberals with their \$23-million surplus, and now I think that there is a real justification for non-belief in the government's figure of \$2.5 billion. One is a surplus; one is a deficit. We know it is going to be bigger. We know that one was not that much.

It is too bad that there is not some way in which we can have an accounting on how they come to their numbers. We should open up the process even further so that we can see where they are coming from, because the Treasurer is given a range by the people in Treasury and he is playing around with the numbers. I agree with the member for Etobicoke West that the Treasurer really does not know where this is going to take us or how deep the hole is going to get; in fact, he will probably be happy if it is not just as deep as it is probably going to be.

We have problems with delays in transfer payments, and I just hope there is more time to discuss that. Everybody in this province depends on what happens out of this Treasury. If the government is going to be so late in doing things then it is going to have a ripple effect right through to the school boards and municipalities. Let's come along and face the music. We should give them some sense of hope out there. We have had double-digit increases in our taxes at the municipal level. We need to have some relief and the Treasurer needs to give some leadership and tell them where it is going to be; he should be positive and come up with a faster answer.

Mrs Marland: In the time remaining I just want to reconfirm what I said in my statement earlier today, that this Treasurer will have to be some kind of magician or sorcerer in order to fulfil his statement of this afternoon.

I would like to also emphasize that there is a tremendously heavy burden on those people who live in the greater Toronto area. We have not yet seen the benefits for those people from the commercial concentration tax, the increase in motor vehicle licences or the driver permits. So I say to the Treasurer, these tax burdens that are added to people and become punitive are totally unfair and unjust. We expect more of this government.

ORAL QUESTIONS

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr Nixon: The member for St Catharines has already adequately described our concern at the inadequacy of the Treasurer's statement. I want to indicate our further concern with the inadequate economic leadership from the government as a whole.

The political platitude "Too little and too late" applies to the situation that the government has brought forward in this statement. In that regard I would like to ask the Premier what he thinks of a program that will reduce unemployment by 0.2%, which involves a \$700-million-plus municipal expenditure in addition but which in fact will

have very little impact on the employment situation in the winter that we are now entering. Is that sufficient for him?

How is he going to answer questions in this House—if we are coming back in the wintertime—having to do with the elevated levels of unemployment and the suffering that is going to be evident in all communities of this province with a program that is going to reduce unemployment by 0.2% and which in fact takes only a minuscule amount of the money presently allocated by this government for the relief of the situation in this particular winter?

Hon Mr Rae: The Leader of the Opposition asked me the question, and I am sure he did not mean it rhetorically, how am I going to answer questions? I am going to do the best I can to answer questions, as is the Treasurer.

I say to the Leader of the Opposition, we have provided tax relief of well over \$500 million. We have injected an additional \$700 million into the economy, plus additional moneys which we hope very much will be forthcoming from the municipalities as well as from the federal government. We have done that after having been in office for a little over two months, prior to the formation of a budget.

I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that we are preparing for the budget. We have been doing that, if I may say so, from 1 October on, as effectively as we possibly can. I think the people of the province understand that in the circumstances we are doing the best we can. We are injecting money right away in areas where it is going to have the most impact, we are proceeding with programs that will have the most initial impact and we are planning for a budget which will go on in the spring. If that is not good enough for the Leader of the Opposition, I am sorry. He was here for five years. He had an opportunity to do the job and now it is our turn to do the very best we can. That is exactly what we are going to plan to do.

Mr Nixon: The budget that I had the honour to present to the House some months ago had \$3.2 billion, which is presently being expended across the province for the sorts of capital works that are certainly worthy and which the honourable Premier has indicated by way of policy will have \$700 million added to it. My point is that only a very small percentage of that, probably less than a sixth, will be spent during the months of this winter.

We look forward to the Treasurer's budget in May, when the tulips are blooming and certain other things are going to be happening. But during the wintertime, when the unemployment impact is going to be the sort of severe thing that all of us will be concerned with, democratic socialists or not, I would put to the honourable Premier that his initiatives are totally inadequate.

For example, I want him to tell the House specifically what he is going to do by way of his promise to have a tax revolt which is designed to stop the goods and services tax. The wording of this statement is rather careful, with sort of a subjunctive approach to the GST on 1 January. We will be talking about his bill to parallel the retail sales tax with the GST and we will be discussing that at the time. But what is this tax revolt? Surely he can be at least as effective as the Liberal government was in stopping free trade.

1430

Hon Mr Rae: I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition is expressing a hope or a fear. I am not quite sure.

In the space of being in office for a little over eight weeks, the Treasurer has made an announcement today that we are going to be reducing taxes and adding to spending for an additional amount of nearly \$1.5 billion to whatever was in the former Treasurer's budget.

He may think that is nothing, but I say to the Leader of the Opposition as clearly as I can, he was in office at a time when the economy started to turn down. He was there in April and May, he was there in June and July and he was there in August. He saw the signs as clearly as anyone. In fact, since he was the Treasurer at that time, he had far more access to information with respect to the downturn than anyone else in this Legislature.

To be fair to the Leader of the Opposition, he announced that it was the plan of the Liberal government to reduce the sales tax by \$1.1 billion. We have decided to do things a little differently, to reduce the effect of the sales tax by half a billion dollars and to inject more capital spending, because we think that is a better mix. That is our view. He may disagree with what we put forward. All I can say to him is, we are doing it as fast as we can. If there are more projects we can bring on stream more quickly under the \$700-million capital program, that is exactly what we will do.

I would just say to the Leader of the Opposition, I think the people who are watching these questions and these answers have a memory. They remember who was on this side up until 6 September. He saw a recession coming and he had a chance to do something about it. We are doing the very best we can as we have taken office and that is exactly what we are going to do.

Mr Nixon: The Premier knows that our response was to allocate \$3.2 billion for capital works during this year, far bigger than any previous government in the history of the province has allocated. We are very proud of that allocation in the budget.

I would say in response that the Premier has indicated that his Treasurer and others have been planning carefully since they took office on 1 October, more than two months ago. The statement today allocates what the Treasurer previously said would be \$25 million during the winter. He has adjusted that now to \$41 million worth of starts during the winter, which would be allocated for payment during the next fiscal year. I would simply say again to the Premier that the platitude "Too little and too late" applies because it is true under these circumstances.

In the program *An Agenda for People*, which says Ontario is now in a recession—and their planning must have taken these difficulties into consideration—the Premier calls for interest rate relief. He plaintively calls in the Treasurer's statement for Mr Mulroney to meet with him and do something about it. That has been totally inadequate for two months. Nobody will talk to him. Even the other premiers do not bother talking to him about these matters. But they did promise specifically interest rate

relief for first-time home owners and farmers. That is a promise. They were elected on that promise. Where is it? That is what we need now. Where is that promise and how is it going to be kept, I put to the Premier.

Hon Mr Rae: The Leader of the Opposition says, where is it; when is it coming? All I can say to him is, be patient. We are preparing a budget. I mean it quite sincerely. What if we were to run off in all directions, if we were to run off without having a real assessment of exactly how serious the situation is, and frankly what we can afford to do? That is exactly what we are assessing now. The former Treasurer took pride in the \$3.2 billion. We have just raised that to \$3.9 billion and, with the additional capital investment of the municipalities, that is going to be an additional amount.

I really think the public who are watching this exchange are going to be rather surprised at what they hear from the Leader of the Opposition. He had an opportunity over five years as the Treasurer to do his best for the provincial economy. He did that, and the people rendered their judgement on 6 September. Now we are going to do the very best we can to deal with the recession which we face. That is what we are going to do.

NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr Nixon: This question is to the Premier as well. He indicated in his last answer that we should wait and be patient. We have the impression from statements made by himself, the Minister of Community and Social Services and the Minister of Agriculture and Food, that in fact government members are sort of observers of the scene, stewards as he called them yesterday, who stand by and hold the seals of office while the economy of the province slides past them and do not take the sort of action that should be required.

There are many communities in the province that are going to be dramatically impacted during the next few months; they are dramatically impacted now and are not well served by this particular announcement. Northern Ontario particularly is one of the most vulnerable.

I would ask the honourable Premier to simply contemplate some statements made by his own colleagues. For example, the present Minister of Northern Development: "Times are not the best in northern Ontario. It is probably going to be a deep and ugly recession." I believe she is correct, and the Treasurer's comments today verify it. The Minister of Northern Development went on and said the absence of a commitment to the northern development fund was not discouraging. "The current recession makes it very unlikely that new businesses would want to get started even if government funding was available." This is quoted in the *Chronicle-Journal* of 21 November.

With that approach from the Minister of Northern Development, how can the Premier possibly effect any kind of development in the north when there is such a negative approach from the minister herself in this particular sensitive area?

Hon Mr Rae: If the Leader of the Opposition says that the Minister of Northern Development is a negative person or being negative in the comments that she is

making, I could not disagree more profoundly. I would say to him that in terms of credibility on northern issues, credibility with respect to what has not been done and what needs to be done, I think that the Minister of Northern Development has a record that is second to none in this Legislature.

I want to stress to the Leader of the Opposition—he can disagree with our approach, and I know he does—I think everyone will be assessing the relative credibility of that approach. Our approach has been to say we are going to inject the money that we can as quickly as we can in those projects that we can pull off the shelf as quickly as we can in northern Ontario as well as in southern Ontario.

Mr Nixon: Where is the northern development fund money? You promised it.

Hon Mr Rae: The Leader of the Opposition is shouting across, “Where is the northern Ontario fund money?” I can say to him it is there. The fact of the matter is that there is sufficient money in the fund right now to address projects that are being put forward until the budget which is coming in the spring.

For us to proceed with spending across the board—whammo, let her rip, do not think about the consequences, just let her go, do not think about it, do not worry about what the operating expenses are going to be in a year—I know enough about the Leader of the Opposition when he was Treasurer to know that he was the person who sat in that cabinet room and said: “No. No. No. No.” Now he is turning around and has the nerve to say, “Why aren’t you spending the money that I never spent for five years?” I do not think you have credibility when you do that.

Mr Nixon: I said no to the extent that the budget of the province of Ontario went from \$23 billion in 1985 to \$45 billion at a time when we at the same time balanced the budget. The reason I put it to the Premier is that he promised there would be more money for the north. Why does he say no when all he is relying on is the money, which he considered to be picayune and inadequate, that was put there by the budget that I had the honour to introduce?

For him to say now that this is sufficient and nothing further should be done while his Minister of Northern Development says that there is such a recession in the north that no more money would help anyway because nobody wants to open a new business indicates the bankruptcy of the Premier’s policy. Why does he not put adequate funds into the economy of northern Ontario to simply keep his election promises?

1440

Hon Mr Rae: I am going to resist the temptation and just say to the Leader of the Opposition that half of the money which is being allocated this year under the \$700-million fund, I have just been reliably informed, is targeted for northern Ontario. One half of that money is already being addressed; it is flowing as of now.

Mrs Cunningham: When will it be spent?

Hon Mr Rae: The member for London North asks, not rhetorically, “When will it be spent?” It is going to be spent prior to the end of this fiscal year.

I say to the Leader of the Opposition that I think those northerners who are watching will know who was in power for the last five years in times when things were very good, and they know full well who is now taking responsibility for an economy which is in recession. All I can say to the Leader of the Opposition is, we are going to do the very best we can in the circumstances. If it is not adequate to satisfy him, I am sorry. We are simply doing the best we can. That is all we are doing.

Mr Ramsay: That answer is not good enough, because what the people of northern Ontario want to have is a reconciliation between what this party said in the election and what it is doing now. The Premier says that this minister has a record. The minister has no record. The first announcement that this minister made was to abolish the cabinet committee on northern development. How is this ministry and this government going to be working on the economic development of northern Ontario?

An Agenda for People states clearly that this government would set up a northern fund of \$200 million a year for the first two years of this government. The people of northern Ontario would like to know whether this government is going to put that fund in place or not.

Hon Mr Rae: Being Premier, I am prepared to listen to lectures on political consistency from all members of the House, including my good friend the member for Timiskaming.

Mr Jackson: Good friend?

Hon Mr Rae: Yes, I say that. In at least one election, I remember campaigning with him; so I assume there are others.

Let me say to the member that the announcements that have been made so far are a clear indication of the commitment of this government to all the people of the province, including northern Ontario. As I said, of the money that has already been directed, that has been decided upon that we can move off very quickly, at least \$20 million is going directly into northern Ontario.

With respect to the question which has to do with the additional moneys to the fund, that decision will be made in the context of the budget. We are working flat out, I think it is fair to say, in the preparation for that budget. The member knows himself, from his experience in other cabinets, that this is a process that takes some time. That budget will be presented in the spring and when it is presented, I think the member will have ample opportunity to see what he likes and what he does not like. I am sure we will have a chance to debate it then.

LAYOFFS

Mr Stockwell: My question is to the Treasurer. We are told to be patient. The minister’s outlook report today has expressed some concern for the economy, and patience is something we should have.

How about the workers who are being laid off today? How can one ask them to be patient? A hundred or so workers in Thorold have been laid off, 51 workers at Eddy Match in Pembroke have been laid off, 230 jobs were lost in Kitchener at Greb, 100 in Kitchener at the Lear plant, 60

in Tilbury and so on and so forth. What about these people? What are they supposed to do for the next few years? What are they supposed to do while the Treasurer decides what his economic forecasts are going to be? How can they be expected to be patient?

Hon Mr Laughren: I think, to be fair, the member for Etobicoke West will realize that we have already announced programs to support people who find themselves laid off. We have talked about that already. I think as well that by announcing a \$700-million capital works program, that will go at least some way towards easing the problem.

I do not stand here in my place and pretend to the member or anyone else that the measures announced today in this economic statement are going to solve all the problems in the province of Ontario. We know that we are in a recession. We know that the recession is going to last at least another six months, probably longer, and that there are going to be problems. I am not going to stand in place and say to the member for Etobicoke West that I have got all the problems solved for the workers to whom he refers.

Mr Stockwell: If the Treasurer is not going to resolve these problems and these people are in fact going to have to be patient, then let's deal with his report today with respect to the deficit.

The Treasurer has stated that a \$2.5-billion deficit does not worry him; a \$10-billion deficit in fact does worry him. Where do we find his projections? Surely to goodness, after doing this work, he must have some idea what the economic impact on this province is going to be and on his government next year. Where will he see the deficit ending up at the end of the next fiscal year? How much will it be?

If he could come clean with the public, I think they deserve that kind of information. They should know where the Treasurer wants to take this province. If he can let them know that, they can measure his success or failure. Is it \$7 billion? Is it \$8 billion? What is his comfort zone? Could the people of this province find out that kind of figure?

Hon Mr Laughren: I have a fairly narrow comfort zone, if that makes the member feel any better. I think the member should understand that, even if I wanted to, I could not stand here in my place and tell him what the deficit is going to be for 1991-92.

As he will understand, I hope, there is a process we go through in this province of allocating funds to various ministries. They come back and state what kind of allocations they want. There is a period of negotiations that goes on. We have not yet decided on any kind of revenue changes that we want to bring in in the budget. We have not even talked about constraints within the various ministries. I do not think it makes sense for the member for Etobicoke West to expect me to tell him what I think the deficit is going to be in 1991-92. I will level with him to the extent I can. I believe it is going to be higher than in 1990-91, but I do not know what that number is.

Mr Stockwell: The Treasurer has a fistful of promises out there from An Agenda for People; we are talking probably to the tune of \$14 billion in promises, in that kind of range. His numbers are not quite that high, but the

numbers that would be considered realistic have got to be in that range. His education promises over five years top over \$7 billion.

Nobody held a gun to the Treasurer's head to make these promises. He made them. He wrote them down. He distributed them. Now he is denying them. When is he going to fill the promises, how much are they going to cost the taxpayers and when is he going to come clean? Nobody held a gun to his head when he was at the landfill sites promising full environmental assessments.

Nobody held a gun to his head when he promised all these extras for the people of Ontario. They believed him. They thought he was going to do them. How much are they going to cost, and when is he going to implement them?

Hon Mr Laughren: I would like first of all to commend the member for Etobicoke West for his rapid transition to the behaviour in this House from the more sedate form of behaviour at municipal council level. I do want to caution the member, though, not to make demands on this government to implement what I agree are expensive promises that were in An Agenda for People. I would urge him not to pressure us to implement those quickly at the same time as his leader is urging us to practise restraint.

1450

NON-PROFIT HOUSING

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Minister of Housing. Yesterday, in response to a question from the member for York Mills, who pointed out that a recent project with his ministry's name on it, a non-profit project, was costing the taxpayers \$2,500 per month per unit, the minister said that his press release was wrong and that he thought it would be less than that. I believe that was the gist of the minister's response and I accept that. I sure hope it is less than that when it finally comes out, but that is what his press release said.

In July the Ministry of Housing said it cost the government \$1,500 to \$1,800 per month to subsidize tenants of non-profit rental units. Could the minister tell us if that figure is still valid, or is it higher than that, after a few months have elapsed?

Hon Mr Cooke: I can indicate to the leader of the third party that the press release that he referred to and that his colleague referred to yesterday in fact quoted the estimate of the subsidy figure given by the non-profit sponsoring group.

Mr Harris: It was out of your press release.

Hon Mr Cooke: I realize that. I read the press release.

I have instructed the Ministry of Housing people that in future press releases when units are being committed—they have not been built yet—there should not be an estimate of the operating cost given that is provided by the sponsoring group, the estimate should be based on the experience of the Ministry of Housing. That figure for the project that was raised in the House yesterday will be approximately \$1.2 million to \$1.4 million and, as I understand it, the subsidy works out to about \$500 a month per unit.

Mr Harris: I want to congratulate the minister for being able to put non-profit housing on the market for a quarter of the cost of the former government. I do not know how he is doing it.

Hon Mr Cooke: It's the subsidy.

Mr Harris: Oh, that is just the actual operating subsidy from the province; it is not the true cost.

Would the minister agree with me that the total taxpayer cost over 35 years for non-profit housing is, as the ministry states and as we see on every press release, in excess of \$1,000 a unit per month for every project we have seen outside of Metropolitan Toronto and \$1,500 to \$1,800 a unit per month in Metropolitan Toronto?

Second, can the minister explain to me how it was reported last July that the private sector could make available to the government and the government subsidize through its shelter subsidy, take people off the waiting list for subsidized housing, luxury condominiums in Scarborough with five to six appliances, marble lobbies, microwaves, indoor pools, saunas, tennis and squash courts for a subsidy cost to the taxpayer of \$850 a month per unit, half the price of the two-bedroom boxes that the minister is building and supplying through the non-profit route?

Hon Mr Cooke: I think the leader of the third party should understand a couple of things, and I think he does. Number one, on the subsidy rates, you cannot compare \$1,500 to \$1,800 with an average of \$500. There is a range of subsidies and he knows that. There are people who are paying market rents in non-profit and co-op housing and there are people who are subsidized for rent geared to income. There is obviously a range; he understands that.

I think he has also got to understand that the vacancy rate in the region of Toronto is 1% and that the vacancy rate in Ottawa-Carleton is 0.3%. If we were to buy the proposals that the member's party put forward during the election and again today, that we not build any non-profit and co-op housing in the province and that we simply make arrangements with the private sector for a rent subsidy program, we would be in even worse shape in terms of the vacancy rates across this province.

It is our objective to have an overall housing strategy that takes advantage of the private sector and the not-for-profit co-op sector, as well as a rent regulation system so that we can have a well-rounded housing program in this province that meets the needs of the people of this province and builds on supply and creates jobs. The leader of the third party might realize that the housing program we are involved in, which was begun by the Liberal Party, will create over 40,000 person-years of work next year. So there is also a very substantial economic spinoff.

Mr Harris: I am not surprised that there is double the number of jobs in providing government-subsidized housing, because it costs twice as much. What I am interested in and what I want to compare—apples to apples, as he asked me to do yesterday—is the cost of subsidization, the cost that the taxpayers pay to house people who need help. By the way, his figure of \$1.2 million with 58 units, if he checks it out, is \$1,700 a month, consistent with what

the ministry says, not \$500 a month, if he checks his calculator. I want to compare apples to apples, the amount of subsidy per unit.

I gave the minister the example of the luxury condominiums; the private sector offered those new units to the government, which the former government picked up and said, "Look, we don't know whether it makes sense or not, but it costs half as much." I applaud them for at least recognizing that. I pointed out that example. Second, the Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario, in a press release and in a proposal of 1 October, offered him 20,000 units—the same number the New Democratic Party wants to build in non-profit housing, costing taxpayers \$1,700, \$1,600 or \$1,800 a month per unit—for \$60 million, a cost of \$300 or \$400 by way of shelter subsidy to put a family that needs help into an equivalent unit. Apples to apples: \$300 to \$400 versus \$1,500 to \$1,800.

I would like to ask the minister, short of having a philosophical disagreement that he wants the private sector out of the housing business and out of the province—I suppose if he accepts this proposal it might put government out of the housing business, and I do not know what the NDP would do if that ever happened—can he explain to the taxpayers who are paying four times the subsidy for each unit why his proposal makes sense to them?

Hon Mr Cooke: I can indicate to the leader of the third party that when I met with the fair rental people I indicated to them that I wanted to pursue their proposal, that I wanted to look at it, because I believe that in the short term rent supplement might be one of the vehicles we will want to use. But I fundamentally reject the approach of the Conservative Party, which would be to eliminate rent regulation, eliminate rent control and simply subsidize the private sector from one end to the other. That is not the approach of this party.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr Callahan: Much has been said about An Agenda for People in this House. We all recognize that the only clear thing in that agenda was that there was a recession. Not expecting to be elected, they made all sorts of promises. We are now in a very serious recession, obviously, as the Treasurer has told us. Taxes are one thing. An additional thing, however, is that during the recent election campaign—this is directed to the Minister of Energy—the now Premier stated on a Radio Noon show on 13 August 1990 that he would ensure the province had the legal power to prevent gas price gouging.

A recent survey by the Ministry of Energy showed that pump prices have jumped about 60 cents per litre in most Ontario cities, supposedly because of the Persian Gulf crisis. Calls to local retailers, and that includes portions I represent, have shown that prices are well over 67 cents per litre and perhaps as high as 70 or 72 cents in the north.

These continual price increases are in contrast to the fact that crude oil has dropped from \$41 a barrel to \$29.15. Can the minister indicate what steps she is taking to protect the consumers of this province and to ensure that oil companies are not making windfall profits by exploiting the so-called Kuwait crisis?

1500

Hon Mrs Carter: I would like to point out that there is a time lag. We have several days' supply in this country so that as the prices oscillate, as they have been doing, where they are at does not always correspond to what is happening as a result of the Gulf crisis. This government is monitoring gasoline prices and we shall take appropriate action if we feel that becomes necessary. We do not feel this is necessary at this moment.

Mr Callahan: Certainly the minister has to be aware of the fact that prices in the province have increased dramatically. This is having an impact on people. Taxes are one thing—they do affect people—but every nickel is important. In my riding just recently they opened up what I suppose in the terms of the Depression would have been a soup kitchen. There are also people—80% of them are young people—who have bought homes who are suffering under power of sale, so every nickel counts. I suggest that when it increased from 57.4 cents per litre in early October to 65.5 cents now, surely the price should be coming down equally as fast as the price of oil drops.

I repeat to the minister that this is very important to the economic survival of a lot of people in this province. Can she indicate what steps she is taking to protect the consumers of this province and to ensure they receive lower prices, and would she be prepared to establish a committee of the Legislature to gather information, monitor prices and ensure that gasoline wholesalers justify all price increases? She may give us the information in the House that she feels there is no need, but the people out there who are suffering that cost and seeing prices go up and down like a toilet seat do not believe her.

Hon Mrs Carter: I just want to state that gasoline prices have not increased as much as crude oil prices. Second, I want to point out that in this province we do now have a policy of energy conservation and efficiency, and one way of avoiding the consequences of increasing prices is to use less. If we all manage to have energy-efficient vehicles, to have our houses efficiently heated and so on, we shall in fact end up paying far less of these increases than we otherwise would do.

COURT SYSTEM

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Premier. The 17 November edition of the Oshawa Times included an article describing how a son broke down and cried in court after seeing the careless driver who killed his mother in a car crash have the charges dismissed due to the length of time he waited to come to trial. The same article details the story of a woman whose husband assaulted and threatened to kill her. The charges were dismissed without even being read. As she left the court, she saw posters promoting Wife Abuse Awareness Week; what a joke, she thought.

Some 3,000 of the 3,400 cases dismissed to date have been dismissed from the provincial court (criminal division). We now have two judges from the Ontario Court of Justice (General Division), and I am referring to Mr Justice Callahan and Mr Justice Trainor, who have said that the Askov case does not apply to the provincial court. Why is the government continuing to permit cases in the

provincial court (criminal division) to be dismissed on consent, stayed or withdrawn? How can this be justified to the victims of crime?

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, I want to say to the member for Willowdale that there are few issues about which I feel more strongly personally than this one with respect to the importance of our ensuring that we have a justice system that works, that we have the assurance that those who are charged will be tried in time, that they will receive a fair trial and that those who have been hurt or affected by people who have been charged will have some assurance that the system of justice is working. As Premier, I can say that I feel incredibly strongly about it. We have discussed it extensively. We have added resources to the judiciary. We are going to be taking other steps. Other measures will be announced by the Attorney General to deal with the issue.

I cannot comment directly on the two decisions that have been made by Mr Justice Callaghan and Mr Justice Trainor except to say that I am sure those decisions are having an impact and will have an impact on the decisions that are made by crowns and, I hope, provincial court judges across the province, but beyond that I really cannot give a comment. I will naturally draw the member's question to the attention of the Attorney General when I next see him, which I hope will be tomorrow in cabinet, because it is a question that needs to be answered and deserves to be answered. It is a good question. It is a question that is on the minds of a great many people and I will endeavour to give the member an answer.

Mr Harnick: If it is in the Premier's power, will he undertake to the people of this province that in light of the decisions and comments by the two judges to which I referred, he will refer an appeal to the Court of Appeal to settle the law in so far as the provincial court is concerned, and that he will do this in an expeditious way by way of reference or whatever, so that the matter can be solved and we can save as many of these outstanding charges as possible and thus justify to victims our good criminal justice system?

Hon Mr Rae: As Premier, I can express what I think is a policy that would be endorsed by every member of this House, and that is that we all want to have a justice system, a criminal justice system and a civil justice system, that works, so that when people are charged with something, it means something—the charge proceeds to trial, there is a disposition on the basis of evidence, and it works.

When we took office, because of the impact of the Askov decision and other things that were not in place, frankly, we found that we had to make very difficult choices. The Attorney General had to make some difficult choices.

As Premier, I cannot really answer the member's question directly, because I do believe that what he is asking essentially are questions of judgement that have to be put to the Attorney General, that are not political questions, that are not partisan questions. They have to do with his responsibilities for the administration of justice to all the

people of the province. I will bring the member's question to him. Again, I think it is a good question. I think it deserves an answer and I will see that he answers it for the member as directly as possible.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Ms Haeck: My question is directed to the Minister of Health. I recently received a letter from a constituent concerned about his ability to obtain a 250-day prescription for his diabetes. This appears to be a ministry policy, but at the same time does not seem to be widely known in my riding. I would wish the minister to comment on that.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: The issue that is being raised here is one which affects the efficiency and effectiveness of prescriptions that are given in Ontario, particularly in the case of older people. It is one where the Ministry of Health has established a pattern of telling prescribing physicians and encouraging pharmacists to provide prescriptions in a reasonable and rational way.

Ms Haeck: I was wondering, in light of the fact that the minister has already indicated there has been some encouragement of doctors and physicians, how widely this policy has been advertised since it does not seem to be taking effect in all places.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I think the member is correct and that the policy should be more widely known in Ontario. I will be asking ministry officials to make the policy as widely known as we can, in as efficient a way as possible.

1510

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr Scott: I am reformed, Mr Speaker. You will be glad to hear I do not intend to ask any more questions about An Agenda for People. It does not seem to me it makes any sense. It was never intended in that sense to be acted on. Nobody expected that this gang would win the election, so we cannot press too hard on that subject.

I have a question for the Chairman of Management Board. As she knows, her principal job is representing the taxpayer in bargaining with, among others, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union. Some members last week commented on the difficulty of performing this in light of her past experience, which was exactly the opposite—representing the Ontario Public Service Employees Union in bargaining with the taxpayer.

I have a question about the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act. That act, by clause 1(1)(g), as the chairman knows, prevents the union from making political contributions to the governing party. I received today a policy and priorities board of cabinet submission, which is dated 22 November 1990. At page 4 of that submission, marked in the margin in capital letters, "new," meaning new proposal to amend the act, it was suggested that the act could be amended so that employees of the government could raise funds for political parties and the governing party.

Will the Chairman of Management Board assure me that the government has clearly abandoned that intention that members of the public service should be able to raise funds for the governing or any other party?

Hon Ms Lankin: I am not prepared to comment on cabinet documents. However, with respect to the issue that we have announced in the throne speech, reform of political rights, political activity for public service workers, the ability for public service workers—of course, they have always had the ability to individually contribute—and the ability for individual workers to be involved in a greater degree in the public service is something we are looking at with respect to the Public Service Act.

Mr Scott: The minister, in being not prepared to comment, has let it remain possible, if not plain, that the government intends to amend the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act so that the government union can raise funds for the government party or indeed any other party.

I have a question ancillary to that. We are now on notice that this may be one of the things her cabinet is going to do, but I want to talk about consultation now. This document which came into my hands had attached to it a letter from the deputy minister of human resources to all other deputy ministers saying in the letter, "We have sent this cabinet paper to OPSEU, but to no other individuals or groups" and, needless to say, not to the Legislature of Ontario. I seem to have been, no doubt on account of historic connections, an accident.

What I want to ask the minister, ancillary to the first question, is: When is she going to, before she comes to the Legislature, stop consulting privately with OPSEU when she refuses to consult with anybody else?

Hon Ms Lankin: Let me start off by saying I am not sure it is a historical relationship that the member has with the union. In fact, as I understand it, he has returned to the law firm that is representing the union on this very issue of political rights. I wonder where the document came from.

May I also say that we made it very clear to this Legislature in the throne speech that we were proceeding with a review of the issue of rights for political activity for public service workers, workers who are in the bargaining unit and in senior management. That is being discussed with senior management and with the representative of the bargaining unit, and I think that is entirely appropriate. As we bring forward suggestions for reform, we will be at that time consulting with members of the Legislature and those outside of the public service who will be directly affected.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Mrs Cunningham: I too want to talk about consultation this afternoon. My question is to the Minister of Education. The Ontario Teachers' Federation and the Ontario Multi-faith Group for Equity in Education have both proposed the appointment of an advisory committee, the one in this report, whose task would be to make recommendations on circumstances under which (1) a constitutionally valid religious program and (2) alternative schools could be provided for by the public school boards in Ontario. When will the minister respond to these requests for an advisory committee?

Hon Mrs Boyd: I am pleased to answer the question this afternoon, having just come to this House from a meeting with the multifaith group and a number of other

interested parties. This is an issue that has been really looked at over a long period of time. There have been a number of consultations with interested parties, and it is certainly the intention of this government to bring forward some response in this session to some of the requests that have been made and to look over time at other possibilities that may not be included in that initial policy. To that end I have agreed today to meet again in February with the multi-faith group. We have made arrangements to meet over a period of time with other interested parties in terms of various constitutional issues as well as funding issues, and that procedure is going forward.

Mrs Cunningham: On that point, the minister will come to understand that the meetings go on and on and on. We meet individually, we meet with groups, and this government has stated loudly and clearly its intent not only to consult openly but to come up with solutions to problems. Will the minister, before making any basic policy decision on the role of religious education programs and alternative schools, consult with all the significant stakeholders by way of an advisory committee as recommended in this report? Will she do that and when? I underline "advisory committee."

Hon Mrs Boyd: I certainly find that the existence of advisory committees suits the style of governance that I feel works best. I feel that members will find this is the kind of issue that is very much the way I prefer to deal with things. Members will recall that I already have announced advisory committees in French and English for folks who are deaf or hard of hearing. I certainly have an intention that at some point over the next few months some kind of permanent mechanism for looking at education about religion in the schools would be my intention. At this time, though, I think it is very important to recognize that this is an issue that has already had a great deal of consultation in the province, that we have a stack of opinions from a large number of people. I do not think it is an area where we have inherited a lot of previous consultation and continue that consultation.

1520

SEVERANCE PAY

Ms Haslam: My question is for the Minister of Labour. In my riding, 110 workers have lost their jobs in the community of Milverton as a result of last July's closure of Deilcraft Furniture. Unfortunately, owing to federal bankruptcy laws, the hard-earned severance pay of these workers at Deilcraft is not protected, and as a result those 110 workers have lost \$780,000 in moneys they are entitled to receive. I have spoken with the workers at Deilcraft, and they understand that existing legislation will not protect them. Can the minister advise us what steps his ministry is taking to ensure that the workers of this province receive the severance pay they are justly entitled to?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I can tell the member that I am aware of the Deilcraft closure in Milverton and of the efforts of the citizens' groups to assist the employees there. She is correct. The federal bankruptcy legislation

does not cover workers in a situation such as this. It is something we have raised for some time. I myself have raised it with the federal Minister of Labour within the last two weeks, attempting to get a speedup in changes in federal legislation. However, I want to assure her that we will not wait on the feds to act on this. My own employment standards department is currently looking at legislation that will protect workers' severance pay in situations such as this.

Ms Haslam: The workers of Deilcraft have also lost a considerable amount in lost wages. The speech from the throne spoke of the wage protection fund. Can the minister advise the House on the status of this fund?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: The purpose of the wage protection fund is to protect workers who lose their wages or their vacation pay in a bankruptcy or receivership situation. The ministry has appointed a supervisor to begin the process of laying out the rules and regulations that will be called for in looking at situations like this. We hope to start calling, in December or right after Christmas, those who have already suffered in terms of receivership and bankruptcy cases and we would hope that we will hear from the Deilcraft employees' group about the kind of things they have run into in trying to protect the workers in that town.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS LEGISLATION

Mr Phillips: My question is to the Minister of Health. I think she well knows that thousands of health professions out there are awaiting the legislation on the health profession regulations. When the previous minister brought in the proposed legislation in June, I think all three parties agreed that it was time to take that legislation to committee and get on with it. Certainly the health professions are anxious to get on with it. I think the public is anxious to get on with it.

My concern is that if we wait until the spring session, we will lose at least six months on a very important piece of legislation. What I would like today is a commitment by the Minister of Health that we can have that legislation introduced now so that in terms of the consultation we can get on in January and February to dealing with it in committee rather than letting six more months go by. I would like that commitment today from the minister.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: The member has raised an issue which I consider very important. I have raised it with my House leader. I hope to carry forward in discussions with other House leaders the possibilities of getting this legislation back into the Legislature and into a period of review during the break so that we can move as quickly as possible on it.

Mr Phillips: Again, as part of that, I wonder if the minister might assure the House today that the legislation will be coming back as it was in June, because I think many of the health professions out there are anxious that there not be changes. If there is any thought of changes, they want to get very active right now. So

that would be the second part of assurances that I would appreciate today.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: I can give the member the assurance that the legislation will come back in the same shape as in June. One additional item might touch on the matter of naturopathy, and in that we would very much look forward to having the contributions of members of this Legislature and indeed of the public during the hearing process.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr Jordan: My question is for the Minister of Energy. Last Wednesday, the minister proudly announced that her government intends to avoid building any new nuclear plants, if possible, by instructing Hydro to increase and accelerate its efforts in demand management. Hydro's demand-supply plan for the next 25 years is currently before the Environmental Assessment Board. Taxpayers' money will be spent to hear public input on the feasibility of this plan, which includes some demand management but also includes the construction of new nuclear generating plants.

Given the minister's position on nuclear energy, will cabinet overturn any Environmental Assessment Board decision to continue with nuclear development?

Hon Mrs Carter: I think that is a hypothetical question. I think we shall have to wait and see what is going to happen in the years to come before we can give a definite answer to that. However, there are a lot of points to remember here. One is that although the recession is a problem for this province, nevertheless it does give us a breathing space as regards energy, because our energy use is not rising as fast as projected.

I could also state that there is no prospect whatever of power shortages even over the longer term because there are many reserve means of providing power that we can call upon. My government has great faith and belief in the efficacy of conservation and efficiency as a means of avoiding the need for generation of large quantities of current in the future. We also have large reserves of hydro possibilities that we can build as soon as they have passed the environmental assessment, which is being speeded up. We expect that large quantities of parallel power will be generated in the near future. We also believe that we are doing the right—

The Speaker: The answer, while being informative, is a touch long. We will allow the member to place his supplementary.

Mr Jordan: I would like to ask the minister—

Hon Miss Martel: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am going to raise this matter today as well, because I have very carefully timed the questions today with respect to the questions from the leaders. I can tell you they were far longer than the response from my colleague. If we are going to be fair in this House about apportioning time to all members, then I suggest we get on with that. But I can certainly tell you, Mr Speaker, that I watched that very carefully today, and the answer that was provided was not in excess, certainly, of the

questions that were posed in terms of time early this afternoon.

The Speaker: It will not likely come as a surprise to anyone that the Speaker has been carefully monitoring both this question period and all previous ones. Quite frankly, there are some flaws on all sides, the subject of which will be dealt with by the Speaker in a subsequent sitting. For the time being, I am allowing the supplementary to be placed. I hope it is succinct, and I hope for an equally succinct reply.

Mr Jordan: If this government is so committed to adhering to the decision of the Environmental Assessment Board, as my party believes it should because it will have considered public input into Hydro's demand-supply plan, then I would suggest that her statement last Wednesday was nothing new. She is just keeping the status quo. The hearings of the Environmental Assessment Board will go on as previously planned. How can this minister continue to take the credit in this House for her government's supposed antinuclear policy when in fact she has done nothing to alter the position of her government?

1530

Hon Mrs Carter: I would just like to say that we believe, as I said, in listening to the input of all the intervenors in the environmental assessment. We shall obviously consider the outcome of that very seriously. I do not feel that we can further commit ourselves on that at this moment.

Mr Hayes: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I feel that my privileges as a member in this House have been abused because the member for St Catharines got up in the House and made a statement that our agricultural finance review committee was not going to be visiting his riding down in the Niagara area. In fact, the minister's office has notified the regional council down there and also notified the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and it was also given to the reporter for the St Catharines Standard.

The Speaker: It may be a point of interest, but not much more.

VISITORS

Mrs Marland: Mr Speaker, I have a point of privilege. You were kind enough earlier this afternoon to extend the use of your gallery to a group called the Peel Association for Handicapped Adults. We did have these visitors in the House this afternoon in their wheelchairs, with some other members in the public gallery, and I know that you would have wanted to have the opportunity to recognize their presence here. It is a very meaningful, very special visit on behalf of that association.

The Speaker: I wish to draw to members' attention that on special occasions, if they would be kind enough to notify the Speaker that there are specific groups seated in the Speaker's gallery, I would be most delighted to welcome them to our chamber.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ONTARIO LOAN ACT, 1990
LOI DE 1990 SUR LES EMPRUNTS
DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Laughren moved first reading of Bill 9, An Act to authorize borrowing on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

M. Laughren propose la première lecture du projet de loi 9, Loi autorisant les emprunts garantis par le Trésor.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Hon Mr Laughren: The government requires authority to borrow in order to meet its obligations. Since a loan act was not tabled after the 1990 budget, I am tabling one now to provide borrowing authority for this fiscal year. Next year I will follow normal practice and table a loan act for 1991 immediately after the 1991 budget presentation.

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 11, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT
(MISCELLANEOUS), 1990

Hon Mrs Boyd moved first reading of Bill 12, An Act to amend the Education Act.

Motion agreed to.

OTTAWA-CARLETON FRENCH-LANGUAGE
SCHOOL BOARD AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

LOI DE 1990 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR
LE CONSEIL SCOLAIRE DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE
D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

Hon Mrs Boyd moved first reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Ottawa-Carleton French Language School Board Act, 1988.

M^{me} Boyd propose la première lecture du projet de loi 13, Loi portant modification de la Loi de 1988 sur le Conseil scolaire de langue française d'Ottawa-Carleton.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

CITY OF YORK ACT, 1990

Mr Rizzo moved first reading of Bill Pr52, An Act respecting the city of York.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

OPPOSITION DAY

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mrs Sullivan moved opposition day motion 2:

That in the opinion of this House, since the Minister of the Environment has acknowledged that even under the most optimistic forecasts of reduction, reuse and recycling there will still remain more than three million tonnes of municipal waste within the greater Toronto area requiring disposal annually;

Has effectively absolved communities within the greater Toronto area of their responsibility to designate interim sites within their own boundaries to deal with the impending garbage crisis;

Has indicated she is prepared to exercise emergency powers to extend landfilling at Keele Valley and Britannia Road in excess of currently allowable volumes, thereby ignoring all safeguards under the Environmental Assessment Act, and order without a hearing of any kind the disposal of garbage into the proposed site 6B in Brampton and P1 Whitevale site;

Has refused to provide this Legislature and the public with the details of her waste reduction strategy, and

Since the present government has clearly abdicated its responsibility to protect the public and the environment, and has failed to provide a sound environmental plan to deal with the impending garbage crisis;

This House therefore calls upon the Minister of the Environment to provide that:

(i) A comprehensive waste reduction strategy be presented to the Legislature immediately for public debate and implementation;

(ii) No existing landfill sites will have their capacity expanded without full and public hearings under the Environmental Assessment Act;

(iii) No region can transport its waste to another municipality in the province without a resolution of the recipient municipality indicating that it is a "willing host" for such waste;

(iv) No regional landfill site that is coming on stream in a municipality having completed the environmental assessment process shall be required to accept municipal solid waste from outside the municipality by the Minister of the Environment's emergency powers;

(v) No new waste disposal sites will be designated within the province without the benefit of full and public hearings under the Environmental Assessment Act.

1540

Mrs Sullivan: I am pleased to be leading off the debate on this motion, which I believe is one of some urgency.

I think there is a fundamental rationale for putting forward this motion and that rationale is shock and, indeed, some anger. Like many others, my colleagues are shocked by the actions of the Minister of the Environment on waste management issues. We are shocked by her threats. We are shocked by her approach, shocked by her naïveté, shocked that she seems to care so little about the very demands that

she made when she was in opposition, and shocked that she has so willingly abandoned the promises of the New Democratic Party green paper, of the New Democratic Party's Agenda for People and of the limited New Democratic Party agenda announced in the throne speech.

I am not alone in that shock. There are many people throughout Ontario who share it, and they are unhappy, they are disappointed and they are frustrated with the minister's lack of action. The base reason for that is that the minister seems to have compromised her principles. She made a great show of being an environmentalist when she was in opposition, but we are seeing a different face now.

We heard the Premier, in question period today, talk about political consistency. Well, I will tell the House that there is certainly none here.

It is not new knowledge that there has been a changed approach to solid waste management over the last decade in Canada, in Ontario, in our cities and in our towns and villages. It is not new knowledge that this approach had as its strongest proponent the member for St Catharines, the former Minister of the Environment, the current minister's predecessor.

The former minister, through his charm, through his doggedness, through his will, made integrated waste management strategy a top priority of every government at every level in this province. Because of his work, every industry, every hospital, every retail outlet, every school, every town council in Ontario was aware not only of the issue but of concerted action plans in which they, as individuals and groups, were participants.

On 10 March 1989 he announced to this House his program for solid waste management. Of the waste produced, 50% was to be diverted from landfill or incineration by the year 2000 and 25% of all waste generated would be eliminated by reduction or reuse. We would generate less waste to begin with, or we would reuse a product again and again for its original, or another, purpose. Another 25% of waste which was generated would be recycled. It would be separated and sorted, and materials would be extracted from it to make new products.

The other 50% of waste, which could not be reused or recycled or reduced, would necessarily be targeted for disposal at landfill sites or through energy recovery operations. Where disposal was necessary, there would be public protection through the environmental assessment process.

The former minister put his money where his mouth was, and I think the current Minister of the Environment would recognize that. The funds committed to the 3R program reached \$54 million in this fiscal year, although I must say that we have not heard whether she intends to change, to reduce or to increase the commitments to that program.

The industrial 3R programs, which were initiated in about 125 industrial projects, were on target at 15% under the stewardship of the member for St Catharines. Recycling in our blue box communities is close to 15%, well on target. In total, under the stewardship of the member for St

Catharines, some \$225 million was going to be spent by the year 2000 for the 3R programs and master plans, and certificates of approval, which were integral to those plans, were being put into place.

Ontario was a leader in developing the national packaging protocol. We knew that packaging wastes in Canada had increased by 80% since 1960, we knew that every family in Canada was throwing away one long ton of packaging waste every year and we knew that four fifths of that packaging was ending up in dumps or incinerators. As a result largely of Ontario's initiatives in that area, a national packaging protocol was adopted in March 1990. That packaging protocol requires 50% diversion of packaging wastes by the year 2000, with interim phased targets to be met. With the concurrence of Ontario's waste advisory committee, there was a plan prepared to implement that in Ontario. It was ready to be brought to the House this fall. I say that the new minister could have brought that plan to the House, but we have seen no action. We have not seen the plan here.

Could it have only been a year ago, on 7 December 1989, when the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore issued a news release following opposition day debate in this House? In that release she indicated, and her leader the Premier indicated, that everyone knows we have an acute and massive garbage crisis in Ontario. That news release included some recommendations: ban the disposal of certain items at landfills province-wide instead of leaving it to the municipalities; require mandatory blue box recycling programs; institute a system of green taxes; set up a waste reduction office.

Those were her recommendations, and yet when the minister spoke to the House on 21 November, what did we hear? We heard, indeed, a repeat of, "There is a crisis in waste management." But how is she going to deal with it? She will use her emergency powers under the Environmental Protection Act to expand existing landfill sites or to open new ones. That is the only measure that she has addressed with any clarity or precision. Did she talk about product bans? No. Did she say that she would make the blue box program mandatory? No. Did she announce new green taxes? No, she did not. Did she set up a waste reduction office? No. She said that she will make sure that the tipping fees and the revenue generated by what waste remains are in fact reinvested in the three Rs.

Municipalities are now preparing their 1991 budgets. Have any of them seen or heard what she meant by this? Have any of them had any information about what will be required of them and what impact this will have on their operations? No, they have not.

The minister promised "firm and aggressive and decisive programs." Have we seen them? No, we have not. Instead, we have seen the minister jettison the Solid Waste Interim Steering Committee initiative. When regional chairmen and their councils in the greater Toronto area were coming to terms with an integrated waste management strategy where the first priority for 50% of the greater Toronto waste to be diverted was given clear preference, where the other 50%, the three million tonnes per year still required disposal and where the disposal

requirements were being approached logically, consistently for both the short and the long term, she threw it all away.

I am very familiar with the operations of that SWISC committee because I come from Halton, where we have spent an enormously long time going through an environmental assessment process in seeking a landfill site that divided our community and cost millions of dollars—\$37 million, I would tell members, in a community of 300,000. During that process of the SWISC action there was a thorough analysis of GTA waste management projections, of actions which have been taken to date, of potential for further action. There was a 3R action plan. I have it here. It involved the initiatives in the plans of all the communities within the GTA. There was public consultation and there were innovative and creative ideas put forward and expressions of interest from the private sector.

1550

There was also a recognition that demonstration projects may have to be put into place before the adoption of some unproven approaches, that indeed some of the traditional ways of approaching the issues may not in fact be the ultimate and appropriate ones.

There was a sense of urgency and I recall that words like "critical," "fast-tracking" and "expedite," were used throughout SWISC's documentation in its 3R action plan. The minister's response was to throw it all away, to set up a new authority whose mandate, she has told this House, has not been defined; whose composition, she told the House, has not been defined; whose time lines and whose authority, she told the House, have not been defined. We do not know yet when or how they will be defined. There is no plan; there is only a pipedream.

The one thing that the minister has said is that her authority would "search for and select new landfill sites for the GTA." It will not be involved in 3R activity and it may be set up in a year or so, after consultation on some of the things that I have mentioned: the mandate, the composition, the time lines and the authority.

But in a year or so we will have a real crisis on our hands. The Britannia Road site in Peel will be out of capacity in one year. The Keele Valley site in York region will be out of capacity in a little over two years. The Brock West site in Durham region will close in a little more than six months. The minister will use her emergency powers to keep the garbage not off the tennis courts, as she is wont to say, but out of our parks and roadsides and ditches and farms.

She will expand Britannia by fiat and Keele Valley and Brock and possibly the Rouge Valley site—we did not get an answer to our question on that one—despite the technical requirements of capacity and volume and contours and despite the knowledgeable views of people in the community. In the next phase, she will use her emergency powers, she has told us, to open the Brampton 6B site and the Whitevale P1 site. If the minister sees an emergency in the offing, why is she not demanding an environmental assessment of the expansion of the Keele Valley site now, of the Britannia site, of the Brock West site, of the

Whitevale site and of the Peel 6B site? Why is she not demanding that now?

An environmental assessment would have reviewed the issues of leachate and ground water contamination. Those issues are already of concern at Keele. An environmental assessment would have reviewed the issues of nuisance, noise, dust, odour, truck transportation and volume. An environmental assessment would have guaranteed that people have a say, an opportunity for a hearing in public.

I had occasion earlier today to refer back to the minister's remarks in a debate much like this a year ago, on 7 December. I would like to read to you what she said then. She said:

"What are we doing in 1989 and 1990? We are moving backwards. We are saying that we can exempt sanitary landfill projects from the Environmental Assessment Act. The strength of course of the Environmental Assessment Act is that if you are evaluating a project under that legislation, it is incumbent upon the proponent to examine alternatives to the project that is being evaluated. Those alternatives are not just alternative locations for a sanitary landfill, but alternative ways of dealing with the garbage."

Is the minister now insisting on full environmental assessments? No. She said she will give us dumps by decree. That is a nasty signal to all of us. Where are her plans? Where are her timetables and her budget? If she has any, why have they not been put forward? Why has she not introduced packaging legislation or regulations? Consumers are demanding action. The national packaging protocol provides sound guidance for implementation and the Liberal government had a consensus agreement from the waste advisory committee to proceed this fall.

The minister said a year ago that certain items should be banned from landfill sites. Where is her legislation and where are her regulations? What about the gypsum wallboard and the construction wastes and the corrugated cardboard? Where are her plans? She said that a mandatory blue box program would be required across Ontario. It is already required in my home town, but where are the regulations that she demanded when she was in opposition?

Where are her green taxes? She must have consulted at some point with Stephen Shryban, who is counsel to the Canadian Environmental Law Association, and be familiar with the Canadian Bar Association committee report on sustainable development in Canada. She must have seen their options for law reform which included a graduated excess packaging tax which would reflect the environmental costs attributable to packaging. But where is the signal that there will be a green tax in Ontario? It certainly was not in the document that the Treasurer put before the House today. There have been no signals because there are no plans and no directions.

Where do we see any increment in demands for 3Rs activity in industry? There are none. Where is the waste reduction office? There is none. What we get is a new authority that will select a landfill site for the greater Toronto area, what we get are broken promises and what we get are irresponsible actions that would not have been

tolerated under our government and I do not believe should be tolerated under this government.

The minister has had time to get her act together. She has had time to put her plans on the table. We have seen what could charitably be called a concept. But there are no targets, there are no budgets, there are no timetables, there is nothing that can be measured. We are shocked and angry and we want to hear where those plans are.

Mr Cousens: I just want to give real applause to the last speech and the member for Halton Centre, a one-handed clap, because I do not know where the Liberals were during the last few years with the kind of words that are now coming forth. I thank you, Mr Speaker, for this chance to participate in this debate.

[Applause]

Mr Cousens: Don't you guys clap because I am about to beat you up, I hope.

Mr Speaker, first of all, let me say kind words for you. It is a great pleasure to see you in the chair again. You have always been a very generous, benevolent dictator, and when you are in the chair, we have appreciated your leadership. Seeing you there now, until you get all that funny-looking regalia that we will put on you soon, you are looking very comfortable in the chair, and I know that you will be a very fair and equitable person in leading this House. Congratulations on your appointment by this House.

I have not had a chance publicly to commend the new Minister of the Environment for her elevation to the deity of Environment. I will be coming back to that theme, but I do wish her well. She looks good in green, and by the time she has had a term of office she might be choosing and wishing for a different colour. Notwithstanding that, on behalf of our party, I wish the minister well and know that it will be kind of fun for her to give leadership to something that she has had so much to say about in the past.

This is quite a motion. To think that the Liberals have resurfaced from what happened on 6 September in such a short period of time with this motion. I just cannot help but laugh. Have they forgotten all the things they did not do when they had the chance to do them? Here they are coming in now, self-righteous, as if we are all to have forgotten the four or five years of do-nothingness that they have been so good at. Now the Liberals come into the House and have a very good motion, which I am going to support by the way, but for them to be presenting it and for them to speak to it the way they did is really another sign of the times.

No wonder people do not have much confidence in politicians. When they are in opposition they say one thing, when they are in power they say another, and when they are out of power and go over to the opposition, then they can come back and be self-righteous again. If there is any lesson to what is going on in this Legislature, it has to do with how your positions change when you move from one side of the House to the next.

Is it any wonder that politicians have a lower rating than car salesmen? Right now we need more car salesmen to get the economy going than politicians just to burn this

place up with—empty, useless words that do not mean a thing, especially when you measure them against the actions. They had a chance to do something and they did not do it. I cannot believe it.

Sure enough, this Liberal government when we had it—and it was too long and already I am beginning to feel the same feelings I had with them with the guys across the floor. Notwithstanding that, here they had the chance, and on 14 March 1989 they had their magnificent plan. They did not announce it in the House. They went up to the Ontario Science Centre and had a little meeting with all the regional chairmen. The Premier did not even involve his then Minister of Environment—

Hon Mrs Grier: The Minister of the Environment wasn't even there.

Mr Cousens: He was not even there. Yet this became their big environmental plan. The Premier came along and had this great big press conference with recyclable paper—no, maybe it is not.

1600

Hon Mrs Grier: The first time he had ever used it.

Mr Cousens: The first time he had ever used it. The member is right.

They came out with a lot of plans, which this government has just reiterated, by the way. This government has come along and said the same kinds of things. "We're going to have waste diversion of 25% by 1992 and 50% by 2000." They have no idea how they are going to do it, none whatsoever, but none the less, those words just bring music to the ears of the people of the province of Ontario. They did then and maybe the government thinks they will now. They will not. We have learned once. We listened to these guys and hearing the same thing coming from the government right now does not give us a great sense of confidence.

Then the government came along and the Liberals said, "Create a state-of-the-art system for processing solid waste." What did they do on that? Sweet nothing to maximize industrial development opportunities. But they go on and have their innovative framework and words, words, words, and we got more words from the member for Halton Centre again today. If there is anything that is really causing this province to sit and wonder what is going on, it is just the words with no action plan, with no design and no strategy to take us there. The Liberals did a poor job, and I have little doubt that if the government just follows their plan, which I think it is doing, it is going to do an even poorer job because it has even started to mess up some of the things the Liberals were trying to do.

I really cannot believe we are into a situation as serious as we have today. It goes back to the very simple problem. As of February 1989 the greater Toronto area had a total of 15.7 million tonnes of landfill capacity. The projected landfill capacity for 1 January 1992 is 4.7 million tonnes. Assuming a current rate of waste diversion, the greater Toronto area is likely to experience a shortfall of landfill capacity some time in the first half of 1993. That is what we are dealing with. We have a crisis on our hands. Finally the minister at least has admitted to a crisis. A few weeks

back, when she was meeting with Metropolitan Toronto chairmen and regional chairmen, she was sidestepping the word "crisis," but a few weeks ago she came in the House and said, "Yes, I think we have a crisis."

I like to compare the new Minister of the Environment to a prophetess. In the Old Testament days when someone was about to be anointed, he or she could speak out and the people of Israel looked at that person and said, "There is a voice sounding the true word, someone who has really got the inspiration from on high to lead people and to provoke thought and inspire confidence."

If anyone was Ms Environment, it was the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, none other, who was stirring the province with all her good words. Her questions to the Minister of the Environment were indeed among the best, and I am looking forward to having those back on the record. They are in Hansard once already. The member for Halton Centre already referred to some of them. There it is.

She has said it all before and now, as she is given the chance to be a true anointed one—because on 1 October she had the hands laid on her by the Premier and she is now the goddess of the environment for the province of Ontario and what we are seeing now is someone who has lost the spirit, because when she was that simple little prophetess out there proclaiming the message, she had the spirit in her. Now she is no longer the strident, strong, stirring, steely-edged, stinging star of the days she was when she was sitting over on this side of the House.

I do not mean to say she has lost it totally. It might be there somewhere but we have not seen it and, in her announcements and pronouncements, we have no sense that it really is going to be there. She just cannot lose it that fast, but she is and the sense in this House is that her party is very quick to forget the promises she made prior to taking office. In the leaders' debate, her leader, the now Premier, said, in talking about the garbage problem: "The current crisis is Peterson's fault. He's been sitting on the issue and done nothing for a long time."

If she thinks she is handling the issue in a proactive way to lead us towards a solution, she is going to have the same thing said of her leader and herself, because she is going to have to have some kind of action plan to demonstrate proof that she is really committed to solving this.

Another thing the Premier said in the election leaders' debate was, "We have to deal with this issue in a fair and upfront way and there has got to be full environmental protection." If there is anything I agree with, it is that. We have to be up front and there has to be full environmental protection. If there is anything that is beginning to worry the people of the province of Ontario, it is the fact that we are not convinced that the minister is going to be up front and we are not satisfied that she has made the commitment to environmental assessment and environmental protection in as full a way as she should.

We have to see some action from her as minister. I venture to say she has the capability within her. When she was the prophetess out in the wilderness leading the New Democrats in their charge for environmental rights in the

province of Ontario, it was not just New Democrats who were believing her. I think we all believed in the kind of thrust. I do not think there is anyone in this House who cannot say that he or she is not an environmentalist. If someone can stand up and enunciate clearly an environmental position, then I think every one of us should give respect to that person, regardless of the party or the partisan politics that are on here.

There is not any ministry that should not be involved in the solution of environmental issues. It is everybody's problem, every one of us. It is not one issue where you can say, "Oh, this is an issue that the government has priority over." Every one of us in this House and in this province has to buy into the environment as a major issue and show our constituents and all the people in this province that we are not only saying the right thing, but we are going to do the right thing and we are going to give leadership to it.

We have really got to see some immediate plans come from the minister that show that there is a mandatory waste reduction proposal to meet the targets of 25% diversion. We believe that recycling has to be done, but how is it going to be done? We still have no details on that program. We have no details on how much the minister expects to save from landfills, how much money she is prepared to give to municipalities for implementation of these proposals.

We have not heard from her enough to tell us really that there is a real, detailed plan that is in place within her ministry or within her own mind. Her call to prohibit valuable resource materials such as wood and cardboard at landfills fails to include any measures for providing secondary markets for these materials. You have to have a market for them. If you are going to take things out of the system right now that are going into landfill sites, then we have got to find a place where we can sell them, where we can use them, where we can take them to. You have got to involve industry in that process and not just try to do it as if you are the government doing it alone. You have to have everybody buying into the solution.

I also commended the minister when she and the member for Halton Centre voted for the member for Mississauga South's private member's bill on mandatory recycling. That was something that was significant in this House. Our own Ms Environment in the Progressive Conservative caucus and still one of the great leaders of environmental issues in my books brought forward a motion in this House that received the minister's support for mandatory recycling. What is she doing about it?

That is one way of putting teeth into her waste reduction measures and forcing more municipalities to look at that. She has Oxford doing it and Midland doing it. How many other municipalities have put any teeth into that? When the minister starts saying that she has got waste reduction measures, she has got words but she does not have a real plan to make it happen.

I am really interested as well in knowing what amendments are going to come forward from this government on the Environmental Assessment Act. The minister has those changes in her hands right now. She has got to have them. Why does she not release them to the House immediately?

She should do it today. She should do it as soon as possible so that the people who are interested in what those changes are going to be will have a sense of what it is.

The Liberals had them ready before they went to the election. Then they told their cabinet members just to sit on them until the election was over, and then they would start dropping them out one by one. We would like to see them. I think that it is up to the minister not to do the same thing her predecessors did in just making statements and saying, "Well, we'll bring it out in due time." At that point, they have got it in for translation services and then it is another delay.

Let's see what it is that the minister is going to be doing with regard to the Environmental Assessment Act. What amendments is she going to make? Why not table them so there can be public discussion on them right now. She has them. Does she admit that she has them? Sure she does.

1610

Hon Mrs Grier: I haven't got any.

Mr Cousens: Well, maybe they have not shown them to her in the ministry yet. They will give them to her and then she can come along.

As the prophet of old, the minister would have had more to say on what those changes were. Now that she is up in the deity, in the clouds of the gods, she does not seem to have the same information that she had when she was down here with us guys, so I just hope that the honourable minister, who is quite capable of coming out with these inspirational messages and these acts of leadership, can do it and should do it as Minister of the Environment, right now without further delay. Where are they? We want to see them. We need to see them. I think there needs to be public debate on them.

I also have tremendous concerns about the minister's new public garbage authority. She was very quick to criticize the Liberal government's strategy as not being environmentally sound, and yet the minister calls for a new authority to search for and select a long-term waste disposal site. The fact of the matter is that the Liberals had planned at least some kind of limited hearings on Whitevale and Brampton. The minister's new strategies have completely removed the possibility of that if she goes and uses her powers as a minister under an emergency situation. She will fall back on her interim plan and then she will be able to do what she wants to do, when she wants to do it, without the full environmental assessment, or even the environmental protection as the Liberals had promised.

The minister seems to have complete confidence that her waste reduction strategy and the changes in the environmental assessment process will give the province enough leeway to be able to get out of the problems we will have by 1994. I do not believe it and the people in the greater Toronto area do not believe it, and the fact of the matter is that the minister has still got her backup plans. Her backup plan could be that she will go and open up Whitevale.

They have stopped dancing out there now, I tell her, once they realized what it was the minister said, that it was not all that significant. They realize that they could still have an interim site in Whitevale, that they could still have an interim site in Brampton, and that she could come along and take Keele Valley and allow it to be expanded and increased, that what she might end up doing is putting another mountain on top of what is there already in order to handle a year's garbage.

The minister's solutions do not begin to address the problem we have right now with landfill sites. If she thinks she can do it just by recycling, it is a noble gesture, a good suggestion, a good idea, but if it does not have teeth in it, it is not going to be sufficient to solve the problem. She is still going to have garbage that has to be placed somewhere.

What I am saying is that the minister has nothing concrete. We have more words from this minister and that does not give me the sense of confidence that she is about to do what is right.

Mr Elston: Aren't you a member of the good news fraternity?

Mr Cousens: What I am trying to do is just lead off so that a few others from our caucus can have a chance for a few kind words to the Minister of the Environment, but I have a few points to close with.

The first is that clearly, in my mind and in the minds of our caucus, there is an about-face on the part of the Premier and the minister with the way in which they are dealing with environmental assessment, the way in which they are dealing with openness and the way in which they are dealing with these issues. They made promises prior to being elected about what they would do with regard to environmental assessment for all sites, and now she is prepared, as minister, to forget those promises. Those are too big to forget. It is clearly an about-face on the part of the minister and the Premier.

My next point is that during the election campaign and before, the minister was adamant that there must always be environmental assessment hearings. It is absolutely imperative that she continue to have that thrust and that she not sidestep that issue now and in the future. It is also important that she have detailed plans for waste reduction and for mandatory recycling. She has to come and lay out how it is going to happen. She cannot just sit up there on her high throne in the clouds and make more pronouncements without telling those of us down here how it is going to be done.

Even if the current diversion targets are met, the greater Toronto area is still likely to experience a shortfall in landfill capacity. We are about to have a crisis, and the people in the greater Toronto area are not going to have an easy solution to it. She will end up having the tennis courts filled with it. She is going to end up having many, many problems because we will not have a satisfactory site.

I happened to listen to what Paul Christie was saying. He is chairman of Metro's works committee. He says that the minister has dumped a process because it offered less protection for one that offers no protection. Under the

Liberals we had a little bit. Now she is taking it further and giving us no protection. Vaughan Mayor Lorna Jackson has vowed a bitter fight with the province if it intends to proceed with plans to extend the Keele Valley dump site.

I am saying we have a situation on our hands that is not being dealt with fully or correctly or completely by this minister. I am sure that if the minister still acted as the Environment critic she would have some solutions to offer. Now that she has been moved into this high office, she has somehow tripped over herself. She has lost sight of the vision she once had. She is now dealing with the kind of words that we had previously from the member for St Catharines when he was Minister of the Environment. She is now sitting up there, listening to something that just does not make sense.

We hope that very soon the minister will come to her senses and come forward with a strategy that means something, something that will protect the environment, and that she will continue to be what she was before, a protector of environmental rights rather than someone who is going to break them. We are concerned over that.

This opposition motion by the Liberals, again, is quite a change in stance for them, but at least they had the courage to come forth with it today. They did not have any sense of knowing what to do when they were in power, so at least today they are maybe waking up. They will have a few years to really wake up and see what it is like on the other side. We are seeing what they are doing—it is not very much; the minister can see what she did—it was even less.

Hon Mrs Grier: The member for Markham is always a hard act to follow. I do not think I have ever been called a prophetess before, and to be elevated from prophetess to goddess in the course of one speech is a compliment that I will accept from whence it came.

I also want to say to the member for Markham that I appreciate the critique he included in his remarks of the member for Halton Centre, because that saves me from using some of my limited time telling the House about the inconsistencies, the confusions and certainly the light-year change in the attitude of that government from when they sat here to now that they are in opposition.

I regret if the member feels I have not accomplished in two months what her government failed to do in five years, but let me assure her that I certainly intend to do what I set out to do, which is to propose and to implement in this province an integrated waste management strategy, something we have not had before. I look forward to the support of the member for Halton Centre and the member for Markham when we introduce the elements of that strategy that will require the support of the members of this House.

I hope that in the course of the debate this afternoon we can have a constructive approach to the issues we face, that we can hear from members on all sides their contributions to the solutions of the problems we face, because we have a problem. We in fact have a crisis. It is a crisis that exists not just in the greater Toronto area, but all across this province. The legacy of inaction, of misplanning, of lack of any aggressive action on waste management that

we inherited when we took office is quite startling. The member for Halton Centre would say "quite shocking."

Let me tell the House the situation with respect to waste management across this province. There are 1,400 active landfills in the province. Some 160 of them are expected to be full within two years. Some 350 more will be full within five years. The average Canadian generates 1.7 kilograms of waste per person per day; in the greater Toronto area that figure is 3 kilograms per person per day. Across the province, 90% of municipal solid waste goes to disposal; 10% is being diverted. That government set up targets: 25% diversion by 1992 and 50% beyond that, but it did not put in place any plans, any strategies, any programs to get us to those diversion rates. That is what this government is going to do.

1620

The problem we have of wasting so much of our resources is an economic one as well as an environmental one. For too long we have looked for ever bigger and bigger sites to dispose of the garbage that we generate, rather than trying to reduce the amount of waste that we generate and looking upon that waste as a resource that is in fact wasted. That is the approach this government is going to take and that is the approach with which we look at both the short-term and long-term problems.

The previous government introduced the blue box program; the emphasis was on recycling. Recycling was the answer to everything as far as they were concerned. They were afraid to tackle the problems of reduction of garbage and the need to reuse our resources. They were afraid to move aggressively with regulations. They were afraid to put in place mandatory programs. They relied on the voluntary sector with the emphasis on recycling. Last September the people of this province voted for a new approach and they are going to get that new approach. They are going to get an integrated waste management system. To put that in place requires a major overhaul of the existing system.

I know the opposition wants to have all the answers today. Let me say to them that that is not possible for two reasons. First, it is not realistic to think that we can turn around in two months something that, as I say, took them five years to create. Second, it is very important to this government that we involve the people of this province in the discussion and in the resolution of these issues, because we do not believe the government can do it alone. We believe there are municipalities out there, industries out there, environmental groups and consumer groups, all of which have contributions to make in looking seriously at waste reduction and at our waste management system. An opportunity for those people to work in partnership with the government is much more likely to reach a solution to the problem than for me to come in here today and say, "This is what we're going to do, like it or lump it."

Our plan is going to take seriously the hierarchy of the 3Rs. We are going to be looking at reducing, reusing, and then recycling. We are going to be looking at the planning of the disposal system in this province. We know how many waste management master plans are in the course of preparation right across this province, and we know the

hundreds of hours and the thousands of dollars municipalities have spent in trying to prepare those plans. We know that the inability of the previous government to administer the system led to frustration and cynicism on the part of many of those municipalities. That is why our policy is designed both to put reduction seriously in place and also to reform the planning process and to adhere firmly to the principles of the Environmental Assessment Act, but to make that act work better.

We had in this House, just about a year ago, a debate on an opposition motion of mine. That motion spelled out very clearly the policies of this government. I want to say that those are still the policies of this government and that those are the policies I will be moving aggressively to put in place.

Let me remind the House of what that motion said. It said that we would adopt the 3Rs in a hierarchical system: reduce, reuse, recycle. It said we would establish a waste reduction office. It said we would legislate mandatory waste reduction and mandatory source separation, that we would pass regulations to prevent the disposal of materials and products for which waste reduction alternatives exist, that we would phase out some kinds of packaging and that we would use financial incentives and disincentives such as a graduated waste management surcharge system to favour reduction and reuse of products.

The motion that we put in place last December, and which was supported on all sides, called upon the government to introduce the needed legislation and to establish the required policies at the opening of the March 1990 session of the Legislature. Did the Liberal government act on that resolution? We all know that they did not and we all know that is why the crisis exists in our province today. That is why the people of the province have put in place a government that is prepared to act in the spirit of that resolution and that is prepared to put in place the necessary regulations to make sure we seriously reduce the garbage that is being generated in this province.

There are a number of very good ideas out there. There are a number of very good initiatives. But there is an incredibly uneven performance in the achievement of any reduction, reuse and recycling. The region of Halton achieved 23% reduction for 1990—it is their target—but for the region of York it is 5%. There is no consistency in the policies, in the support from the provincial ministry. There is no system in place to get serious about reduction and that is what we are going to do.

There is an enormous amount of goodwill out there for the initiatives I introduced and mentioned in this House. There is an enormous amount of support, and constructive suggestions out there about what we should do. We are consulting widely. We have already begun to consult and have met with environmental groups, and we hope the opposition will share with us its constructive ideas as to how we can resolve the issue.

When it comes to moving on the approvals side of the equation, the past government was very quick to take shortcuts with the approvals process. They were not prepared to take shortcuts to get to reduction. We have clearly said that we do not see the need for interim sites.

We know that we can move aggressively on the 3Rs and that we can reform the environmental assessment process so that the frustrations, the delays, the roadblocks in the way of reaching a long-term site for the greater Toronto area and for all those other municipalities that lack disposal capacity will be eliminated.

The document that is available, which I am going to release very shortly, that was prepared for the previous government and was referred to by the member for Markham spells out some ways in which the Environmental Assessment Act can be improved. It does not spell out the specific amendments and I will be looking for some feedback from the opposition, as well as from people across the province, as to what those appropriate amendments should be.

Let me tell the House that those amendments are designed to improve the opportunities for public participation in the environmental assessment process much earlier than is now the case, that those changes look for an early identification of the issues to be dealt with during the environmental assessment process, and that those amendments will look to put time limits on different parts of the process so that the frustrations and the delays I have alluded to are no longer there. The region of Halton took 11 years to go through the environmental assessment process to get a landfill site, 11 years and countless dollars. That is no longer acceptable and that is not what the people of this province want.

The initiatives of reduction and of improvements to the Environmental Assessment Act will benefit people all across the province, and here in the greater Toronto area they will greatly facilitate the search for a long-time site and eliminate the need for interim sites and for emergency sites. I hope that the members opposite will lend their support to our efforts to get serious about reducing garbage so that not one extra tonne of garbage than needs to happen goes into Keele Valley or Britannia or Brock West.

The motion that we are debating today is very confused in many of its elements, confused in the preamble and confused and contradictory in its resolution. It is not a motion this government is prepared to support. It is not a motion that contributes to what has to be the bottom line, what is best for the environment of this province. Seeking ever bigger and bigger disposal sites is not what is good for the environment of this province.

This government has indicated that it is prepared to give the kind of leadership that has been lacking in dealing with waste management, that we are prepared to make the tough decisions and that we are prepared to move aggressively to make mandatory some of the things the opposition is calling for today, but which they were not prepared to do when they stood on this side of the House.

1630

We are going to give opportunity to people across the province to join in a partnership with this government within the greater Toronto area. It will be a partnership between the regions and the province, across the province. We will be working with municipalities, environmental groups and community groups to put in place the kind of programs that are appropriate to their community, because

what works in Metropolitan Toronto may not work in Haliburton. We need to be able to work with those people to make sure we are helping them do what they want to do, what they have said they have wanted to do and what they elected a government to do, which was get serious about reducing waste in this province, not continue to dispose of it by means that are not good for the environment. That is our bottom line.

I stated at the beginning that we had inherited a legacy of waste disposal problems from one end of the province to the other. It is not our intention to leave a legacy of environmental disaster garbage sites for our children and for our grandchildren in the years ahead in this province.

Mr Offer: I rise today in support of the motion of my colleague. I have had occasion, of course, to listen to the honourable minister. The minister should be very much aware that as a result of her announcement of 21 November there has been created a very real emergency not only in my riding of Mississauga North but throughout the city of Mississauga and region of Peel.

My riding is home to the Britannia landfill site, which is the recipient of garbage for all of Peel and has been for many years. The minister's decision of 21 November effectively put a stop to an environmental protection hearing which would have selected an interim site in north Brampton. Her decision impacts directly upon us in Mississauga North and throughout Mississauga and the region of Peel.

I want to talk about that impact and talk about four realities. Reality number 1: The Britannia landfill site has approximately one year until it reaches capacity. Everyone in my riding knows this; everyone in Peel knows this. In fact, the minister knows this. It is found in her own backgrounder, which reads: "The Britannia Road landfill site services the waste disposal needs of Peel region. It will close by the end of 1991."

Reality number 2: It will take much more than a year to complete the hearings for a new site. By stopping the hearings at this time, a time gap or, better still, a garbage gap has been created. This garbage gap is the time between the date that Britannia reaches capacity, one year from now, until the new date when a new site can be created. I believe that today that garbage gap is probably in the vicinity of one, two or three years.

Reality number 3 is made up of three parts. When Britannia reaches capacity and there is no other site to be used in Peel for the disposal of our garbage, it means of necessity that we will have to transport our garbage to another site, wherever that may be. The taxpayers in the region of Peel will have to pay increased transportation costs. The economics are simple. The greater the distance you have to transport garbage, the greater the cost.

The second part of this reality is that the region of Peel receives what are called tipping fees. If there is no site in the region to dispose of garbage, then there are no tipping fees to be received.

The third part of this reality is that if the region has to transport to another site it will have to pay that other site tipping fees. When one adds up those three parts of this third reality, increased transportation costs, loss of tipping

fees paid, payment of tipping fees, the total, as advised by the region, is \$100 million.

The fourth reality, and I find this to be most objectionable and disturbing, is that when the Britannia landfill site reaches capacity and another site in Peel has not yet been determined and the province is unwilling to pay for the extra costs in terms of transportation fees, tipping fees lost and tipping fees having to be paid, it will be apparent that the only other solution is to extend the Britannia landfill site, to extend this site without hearing, without public consultation. As the local representative, I find that to be totally unacceptable. Even more, I find it unacceptable because the minister in her own words states it would be "irresponsible to take risks with public health and safety."

The question in the final analysis is, why would the minister then permit the potential expansion of Britannia on her order, as already admitted? That cannot be done. It cannot be allowed to take place.

In our region, our municipal representatives have recognized the demands and challenges of waste disposal and the need for a new landfill site. They took action, they planned, they were ready, and now the minister's announcement puts all that planning, that expense to be ready and the willingness to meet that challenge to naught. The minister has broken a promise that there would be a full hearing.

On the basis of these four realities, I cordially invite the minister to come to the Britannia landfill site one year from now to close that Britannia landfill site, to attend the closing of a site that has been the recipient of Peel garbage for many years. The minister's attendance is welcome; a minister's emergency order to extend this site, to create a tower of trash without public consultation and hearing, is not. Do not fail us, Madam Minister.

Mrs Marland: The irony of getting up today to speak to this opposition day motion placed in the name of the member for Halton Centre is that it is placed by a Liberal member. It is an incredible irony when you get into what is actually said in this motion. I am not saying I am in full agreement with all of the announcements and decisions made by the current Minister of the Environment a week ago, but it has to be very significant that the Liberal opposition in this House is supporting a motion with some of what is in it.

I do give the member for Halton Centre, who is momentarily out of the House, full credit for the fact that she did support my private member's bill to make mandatory recycling a responsibility of all the municipalities in this province. However, at that time the balance of the Liberal government members in this House saw fit to vote against my private member's bill, therefore defeating a requirement that all municipalities in this province offer a basic recycling program in terms of at least the blue box program.

Remembering that the blue box program was in fact introduced by the former Conservative government in this province, we might as well lay all the laurels and all the credits where they belong. It certainly was our party which introduced that system of recycling and started

the initiative. How ironic that the Liberal government, when it took over and was faced with the same crisis in waste management in this province that is now being faced only in an accelerated form, could not even see the value in mandatory recycling. Except for two members of their caucus, one of them being the member for Halton Centre, they voted against my private bill on that issue.

Now we have today a motion from the Liberal opposition party that says some very interesting things. One of the aspects of the motion that I find particularly significant is that they say, "No existing landfill sites will have their capacity expanded without full and public hearings under the Environmental Assessment Act." They go on to say in item 5 of the resolution that, "No new waste disposal sites will be designated within the province without the benefit of full and public hearings under the Environmental Assessment Act."

1640

I say to the member for Halton Centre, although I give her credit for the content of this motion, that I hope she has been able to convert all the other members of her caucus who I assume were behind the former Premier, because it was a very bad day in this province when Premier David Peterson made the announcement. I emphasize that it was the Premier who made the announcement, because it was not even the Minister of the Environment who made the announcement but Premier David Peterson who announced in this province that all interim landfill sites would be exempt from the full Environmental Assessment Act.

Is this not significant? Because now we have the Liberal caucus standing today and saying that everything has to go through the Environmental Assessment Act. All I can say to our Liberal members is welcome aboard. Finally, they have seen the light and finally they are on side with us. The significance of the difference between the Environmental Assessment Act and the Environmental Protection Act has finally come through. We are very happy that although they are not in the government any more, they finally do realize what is necessary. We are only hoping that the current Minister of the Environment, who also believed when she was in the opposition that all landfill sites had to be subjected to full environmental assessment—We only hope that the full Environmental Assessment Act will be applied to the approval of any new landfill sites in this province.

It is also significant, of course, to realize that our new Premier has also given assurances and promises about where he stands on this terribly important issue. In the 1990 election leaders' debate, the Premier said: "Reducing packaging and the amount of garbage is not a long-term solution. That's a short-term solution." He went on to say, "We have to deal with this issue in a fair and upfront way, and there's got to be full environmental protection."

I simply ask both the Premier and his Minister of the Environment how it is that in such a short time, less than three months, they can say one thing to the people of this province and yet in their own announcement say something that is very different and, in fact, very regressive.

To ask the region of Peel to expand and extend the life of the Britannia landfill site along with the Keele Valley site is a very significant request and totally unrealistic. We have to be very concerned about some of the solutions that are being brought forward on the management of waste in this province. I am not saying I am not sympathetic to the current Premier and his Minister of the Environment. I certainly concur with their comments that they have inherited an accelerated mess after five years of Liberal government in action. But I am saying that we will plead with them that, being the committed environmentalists we were lead to believe—and certainly every position they ever gave in this House confirmed that—now that they are the government, we would hope they are not going to change their commitment to the preservation of the environment.

In fact, it is rather ironic, because one of the landfill sites they want to expand—namely, Britannia, as I mentioned a moment ago, in the region of Peel—is one of the landfill sites that has not accepted wood or cardboard for the last three years. They are already doing something about the diversion so that they do not accept unnecessary materials for their site. The irony is, however, that the current Minister of the Environment has not given any credit for what is currently going on in operating sites.

She talked in her announcement about having a discussion document on the Environmental Assessment Act. I would say to that minister, in fact I would plead with her, to please not go the route of the typical Liberal solution, which was, "Let's get a discussion document out." When the minister was in opposition, she said there had been enough talk. I am standing here today saying there has been enough talk and enough discussion. We do not need any more. What we need today, now, are the solutions and not the discussion papers. In fact, the Canadian Environmental Law Association four years ago brought forward some very worthwhile recommendations to deal with the waste management crisis in this province. Certainly, when we look at how accelerated that crisis is today, there is no reason we have to have another discussion document: We simply say that if the environmental assessment process is a problem, we know it is a problem through the approvals branch of the Ministry of the Environment.

There is no question that under the full Environmental Assessment Act, the process is elongated. It is too costly in terms of the length of time it takes to get these approvals. The solution is for the minister simply to hire contract staff in the approvals branch of the Ministry of the Environment and expedite the turnaround time for the comments for these applications for landfill sites. We do not have to shorten the process in terms of the investigation and the thoroughness. I want to emphasize that. We do not want to put the environment at risk because we expedite something. I am simply saying it can be just as thorough under the Environmental Assessment Act if the ministry would hire contract staff to expedite the process. In expediting the process with contract staff, what happens is that we end up with contract staff that are not permanent additions to our bureaucracy in this province. Once we get caught up with

the backlog of applications, then those staff no longer have to stay in the employ of the Ontario taxpayers.

There is a solution to streamlining the Environmental Assessment Act without going out for more consultation and more discussion. I certainly hope this Minister of the Environment will make some decisions instead of putting us in a position we have been in for the last five years, which is the same old Liberal solution to everything. The Liberal solution was to produce a discussion paper and send it out for comment. When the comment came back, they filed it. We got so many reports on so many different issues in the last five years which cost the taxpayers of this province millions of dollars. Those reports just sit on a shelf somewhere gathering dust.

We simply say to this minister that the solutions are there for waste management. It takes leadership to exercise those solutions that exist. We cannot just keep dumping off the responsibility. I use the word in the literal sense. We cannot simply dump off the responsibility to other causes and look for other remedies. The remedies are there. We do not yet know whether this new authority the minister has established is a crown corporation. We do not know whether it is going to operate similarly to the water and sewer crown corporation that the Liberal government established. What it is doing is simply putting something out there that creates another level of bureaucracy which costs more money to the Ontario taxpayers.

I am going to complete my comments, because we are short of time. We simply ask this Minister of the Environment to please show her own direction and her own leadership and not send us round the same circuit we have been around the last five years with the Liberal government. We say to her and above all we plead with her not to use emergency powers in dealing with the expansion and extension of existing landfill sites in this province without full environmental assessment. The full environmental assessment can be done if she has the will to apply the number of staff needed to expedite the process, and then we will not be in a position where something as critical as the expansion of the Britannia landfill site in the region of Peel ends up being the solution because nothing has been done in a real, strong, strategic way.

1650

Ms Churley: I want to spend just a few minutes telling members a bit about my background. I promise I will not bore them with a lot of details like the time I was kissed by Joey Smallwood when I was a baby and that sort of thing, which turned me against the Liberals for ever.

However, I do think it is important for members to realize that not all of us on this side of the House, and I am sure over there, are bankers or lawyers or from the business community. A few of us happen to be from community grass-roots organizations, and I am serious. I would like to let members know a little bit about the perspective that I bring to this issue, as the parliamentary assistant to the environmental goddess sitting to my left, as she has been labelled today.

In 1983 I became the first president of Citizens for a Safe Environment. As members may know, that is a local

group in Riverdale which was formed to be the intervenors against the city of Toronto's plans for an environmental assessment for a giant incinerator in our backyard, in an area that was already highly polluted. Getting into that organization made me become very involved in waste management issues. Then in 1988 I ended up running for city council, mainly on environmental issues from the grass-roots perspective.

In my short time at city hall I brought many environmental issues to city council. I would like to list a few of them: water conservation; trying to get post-consumer, deinked paper; energy-efficient office; trying to green city hall, as we are trying to do here now at the Legislature, among other issues. One of the things that I ended up doing was getting city council to support me and asking the then Liberal government to allow the city enabling legislation so that we could begin to ban certain kinds of packaging in the city of Toronto because the Liberal government was not doing it.

Now, it is ironic—at that time I did not even know I was running for here—that on my first day in the House I ended up introducing that bill to this government. We shall see what happens with that, but it is rather ironic.

Mr Sorbara: What does this have to do with Joey Smallwood? What is this about? What is she talking about?

Ms Churley: But I am getting to the point here.

What I discovered at that time was that we were not, as a municipality, getting the leadership that we needed from the provincial government in order to tackle the waste management problems that were engulfing us, as they are every municipality. That is something that this government wants to change and has to change. There has to be a partnership, and that is not a cliché. There has to be a partnership and there has to be leadership coming from the provincial government. There has to be fairness across the board however we approach this issue, and that in fact is what we are doing.

It absolutely astounds me here today to hear the former Liberal government and the former Conservative government talk about all that they have done on this issue. The reality is, both past governments have stood back and dithered while the current waste management crisis grew. Unfortunately, disposal had been targeted as the centrepiece of the previous government's waste management strategy. Then when they got a little bit of a message that they had to change that a little, it became clear that the focus had to change a bit. The biggest mistake was emphasizing recycling at the cost of the sound and less resource-consuming solutions like refillable containers. There is a bit of a myth around that the Liberals brought in the blue box program. In fact, the Conservatives may be pleased to know, if they do not, that it was brought in around 1975 under the Davis government, a minority government. Then the Liberals, as I mentioned yesterday, released relaxed soft drink quotas in favour of the blue box.

I am not knocking the blue box. It is a good thing for people to be involved, but it is such a tiny, tiny part of the

solution, and the real answer is reduction. We know that. That is the only solution to this waste management crisis. That is it. That is the area that we have to move in as quickly as we can, and what that involves is getting serious about the problem and regulating, using our enforcement powers and our fiscal powers to bring in regulations where necessary. We regulate with liquor laws, we regulate traffic, we regulate in all kinds of areas and people do adjust. This is where we are heading, in this direction.

We are also listening to groups like the It Is Not Garbage Coalition, which tells us very clearly, as we all know, garbage is not garbage, it is a resource that we can reuse. We must start moving in that direction. These people are at the forefront of the new direction in which we have to think about garbage. It is not garbage any more.

They are at the very forefront, and a few years down the road people will not laugh as they did when they read *Silent Spring*. We were told that DDT was a dangerous substance and politicians and scientists laughed at that time. We now know what DDT does to people. A few years from now people will not be laughing at this concept. That is the direction in which we have to move.

We are moving in that direction, we are to use that C-word, consulting, because the difference is, we are going to tell people that we are regulating and we are going to sit down and consult with people about how to do it, not sit down and say: "Gee, we think we may have to regulate. Do you think you might go along with it, industry and consumers and everybody else?" We are going to do it because it has to be done.

In closing, I would like to make a point that we are not paying lip service to the 3Rs as the other previous governments have, and that is why we are in crisis. This waste management plan we have walked into is in chaos. You do not really expect the Minister of the Environment, a few weeks after taking office, to take this chaotic situation and suddenly have all the answers. That is ridiculous. In five or 10 years, the chaos has been created.

I would just like to say that we are not going to make the communities be the only ones to pay for this crisis. That is what the Liberal government did. The Liberals said: "We need interim sites. We are going to put them in your backyards, with just the Environmental Protection Act." They did not say to the producers of waste, "We have a crisis and therefore we are going to have to regulate you." They said, "Gee, you can have all the time in the world to think about this, and then maybe volunteer when the day comes." What we are saying is, everybody has to get in on this act and that industry and commercial sectors have to share the burden by accepting regulations.

The minister will be announcing in a short time. We are working very hard on this issue. It is a top priority. We realize that it is a crisis. We realize that we have been left with chaos, and we will have a rational, carefully thought out plan, I am sure, to bring before this House very soon.

1700

Mr Sorbara: We have now been sitting in this House for three, almost four weeks, I guess. The minister made her announcement back on 21 November. She said in her

speech that it was well received among environmental groups around the province. I followed the press the day of the announcement and subsequent to that and I did not see one endorsement of the minister's plan from any environmental group.

Let me tell the minister before she leaves the room that the very night she made the announcement, she had the opportunity to speak with one of the province's and, indeed, one of the nation's most outstanding environmental crusaders and environmental critics and environmental advocates, a woman named Lyn MacMillan, whom you will know, Mr Speaker, and whom I think most of the members of this House will know has been active in this area for several years. In fact, she was the woman who helped design the Niagara Escarpment plan and saved the escarpment from the kinds of ravages that were being proposed for it.

I want to tell members of this House that Ms MacMillan, in talking with the minister that night, condemned her plan from beginning to end. She said it was not workable, that she could not do it, that her timetables and lack of plans were totally unrealistic and that she was setting back the process of dealing with a very serious issue many years. So her statement today that her plans have been well received is simply untrue. The worst thing about what the minister has done here is that she has incorporated into her plans something which violates fundamentally the principles that she and her party argued for the five years while I have been a member of this House.

During the debate that she referred to, the debate of almost exactly a year ago—these are the minister's words, and I hope the member from Essex-whatever-it-is can leave the minister alone for a moment because I want her to hear these words. She said a year ago, the following: "The result of the minister's attitude and the fact that so many of these dumps are now going to be looked at under the Environmental Protection Act as opposed to the Environmental Assessment Act, is that the municipalities and the groups—the representatives of some of them are here today—share a very common and legitimate concern, that the sites will not be adequately evaluated."

What has the minister done? In three sites in this province, in the greater Toronto area, she has said that she will have no process at all, that she will decide, that she will be the czar of the environment, that she will use her emergency powers to decide whether or not those sites will stay open.

When the glass of water is filled, if you put anything more into it, it spills. And that mess, I tell the minister, will contaminate the province. She simply cannot do it.

Now, she has an ambitious plan. We do not know the details, we do not know the budgets, we do not know the timetables.

Hon Mrs Grier: Will you support it?

Mr Sorbara: The minister says, will I support it? I will tell her that when she brings in the details, I will support it on one condition: that she retract her commitment to use her emergency powers, that she will not, under

any circumstances, use her emergency powers to expand sites when they are full.

The irony and the great defect in her suggestion back on 21 November that she would use emergency powers is simply this. I will use Keele Valley as the example. Keele Valley has capacity to take garbage for another three or three and a half years based on the current rate. The minister said, "We do not think we will need additional interim sites."

I want to tell her that we are still in 1990, that if she is serious about not needing any interim sites, she can announce today in this debate, or tomorrow or next week, the fact that in order to avoid the arbitrary use of emergency powers in all of the potential sites she said she might have to look to, she will start right away with some hearing process.

She advocated the Environmental Assessment Act, and that is certainly what the people of Maple want, what the people of Vaughan want, what the people of York region want and what the people of Ontario want. Let her choose any hearing process, but certainly with three years available in order to consider the matter—

Hon Mrs Grier: York was going to nominate it as an interim site under your process.

Mr Sorbara: The minister says no one will nominate her, but today, tomorrow or next week she could, in her interim plans, simply announce that she will not use her emergency powers—that will solve the defect of this strategy—and announce that she will give the people of this province the very hearings that she herself argued for for five years in this House. I call upon the minister to do it.

Mr B. Murdoch: I am pleased to be able to address the resolution presented by the honourable member for Halton Centre as it relates to municipalities across Ontario. The resolution states that "No region can transport its waste to another municipality in the province without a resolution of the recipient municipality indicating that it is a 'willing host' for such waste." Our party has always believed this and I have no difficulty in supporting this concept. Indeed, in the Toronto press on 19 August of this year my leader was quoted as saying that no municipality should have to take any other area's garbage unless it agrees to do so and that the region with the problem should have to find a willing host.

I realize that this resolution deals with the greater Toronto area, but I would like to point out in the House that this is not just a Toronto problem but one that is affecting or will soon affect many parts of the province. It is now municipalities outside the GTA that may be pressured to take waste which is not their own, as in the case this summer in Orillia.

I am a little surprised at this member from the Liberal Party who is raising this issue for debate. I realize that the honourable member's riding could be directly affected, but I wonder why her government did nothing to prevent this situation from occurring when it had the chance.

In the last five years we in Ontario have realized that time is quickly running out and that we will soon be faced

with emergency situations. Over two years ago the former Minister of the Environment predicted that at least 160 municipalities would run out of landfill space by 1990 and that another 150 would need additional landfill capacity within the next 10 years, yet the minister did nothing about it. Since taking office in 1985, the minister approved only five new landfill sites. Therefore, it seems strange that the member for Halton Centre is focusing on this new government, which at least seems to understand that the environmental assessment process must be more efficient and effective, even if it may not do it quickly enough, rather than on her own party. There was a lack of planning by the Peterson government and now the municipalities will be asked to bail out the province, which caused the problem in the first place.

Many municipalities have helped find a solution, have implemented blue box recycling programs. We all agree this is an important initiative, but as of March 1990 only 16% of waste from households using blue boxes has been diverted from landfill sites and the municipalities are finding the cost of funding these programs fairly heavy to bear.

I am pleased that the minister plans to reduce packaging. Our party advocated that as well during the recent election campaign and I applaud the minister for listening to us. The problem is that the minister has released no details as to how she plans to achieve her reduction goals. Municipalities are suffering because of this lack of detail and some, like Metro Toronto, are being forced to consider their own agenda, which includes a limit on household garbage and a user-pay system. If every municipality is forced to do this, we will have a completely uneven system across the province. The minister states that she is going to further fund recycling programs, but again, municipal councils do not know how much or when the funding will begin. I ask the minister to consult with local governments on this issue as quickly as possible so that they will have some idea of what this government expects of them.

Mr Wiseman: It is indeed a pleasure to rise on this occasion to speak to this resolution. Before I do that, though, Madame Speaker, I would like to congratulate you and the other speakers of the House on attaining your positions and I would like to congratulate all the members who have been elected. Since this is the first time I have had a chance to speak, it is indeed a pleasure to honour everybody by congratulating them.

I would like to also congratulate the Minister of the Environment, because I believe that what she has done is the most courageous event that has come to the floor of this House in at least the last 20 years. It is courageous because it takes a new direction. It takes a direction that every environmental group and every recycling person and every person who is concerned about the environment has asked for and not received from any of the previous governments. I congratulate her and I think that her stand is absolutely one of the most courageous there is. I endorse it fully.

1710

But I am not alone in endorsing it fully. The member for York Centre indicated that nobody anywhere supported

our minister. I would like to point out that a letter from Garrett Associates, from the Pickering-Ajax Citizens Together for the environment, a group with which I am intimately familiar, since I helped found it three years ago—in the office of one of the former Liberal members, by the way—has said:

“Our clients fully support the direction that your government appears to be taking. They wish to be the first to offer your ministry assistance through active participation in the development and implementation of the proposed three-part waste management strategy.” That comes from a group that has no average understanding of what waste is all about.

My constituency, Pickering and Ajax, has had to suffer the obnoxious, stinking perfidy of Metropolitan Toronto’s garbage for almost 30 years, first with the Beare Road landfill site, which took 18 million tonnes of garbage approximately, and then for the next 14 or 15 years with the Brock West landfill site, which is still open. No one in that community needs to be told what it means to have a garbage dump in the backyard. It stinks. They cannot use their backyards for barbecues or for swimming, and no one ever knows when the dump is going to react. No one knows why they react that way and very little study has been done to find out why they react that way.

As time went on and the Liberals in the previous government suggested that they use Whitevale, it was normal for the people of Pickering to react the way they did, having been inundated with the obnoxious odours for so long. They rallied behind PACT and they rallied to prevent the creation of another dump in their backyard. They are by no means NIMBY. All they ever asked for was equality under the Environmental Assessment Act, which was denied to them by the Liberals.

We hear all this rhetoric from both sides, through all the catcalling and heckling and so on, and I think one of the major reasons is that members opposite have not been intimately involved with the garbage process, as I have for so long. I have no fear that we will attain our goals.

Mr Mahoney: You’re the only knowledgeable one here.

Mr Wiseman: I did not say that. I said I am intimately familiar with the process. I have no fear that we will meet our objectives. The reason I have no fear is because there are examples of other communities that have done so.

For example, Cardiff, Wales, collects its biodegradable, compostable material, uses it in an anaerobic digester and then uses the composting material to reclaim parts of its countryside. That is ongoing now. Belgium and Holland, for example, do not have landfill sites because they recycle and reuse and reclaim everything.

Wood was mentioned a little earlier. I have two offers from the private sector already to take the wood that will not go to landfill sites, to be used in a number of capacities.

We will take another look. I promised my party members that I would not take too long. I would like to point out that the public is way ahead of the opposition, way ahead. I am going to quote from a group that is called Zero

Garbage. They believe that everything can be reused, reduced or whatever. They believe that there is no need for garbage sites and to prove it, when Durham region said that it would put a garbage dump in their backyard, they cut their garbage production by 50% in less than three weeks. So it can be done.

Also, from this article in the Oshawa Times from 21 November 1990, David Climenhage, an engineer with DuPont Canada, said: “Five leading plastic types make up over 90% of plastic found in refuse and these could be recycled with pilot projects under way in Peterborough. Across the province recyclable plastics are finding their way into some 900,000 blue boxes weekly.” So there is a willingness by the public to get involved and fall in behind this program.

Now I would like to turn just for a moment to this motion. I think that I will use a quote from the member for St Catharines earlier. He said, “It is indeed interesting what flows from the opposite side of the House.” I would like to use that because in reference to this motion we have here one of the very interesting twists of irony that I am sure the former member for Durham West would sorely like to have seen at least six months ago. Had it been there, perhaps I would not be here. That is the last part of this motion, which says, “No new waste disposal sites will be designated within the province without the benefit of full and public hearings under the Environmental Assessment Act.”

This is the most obnoxious example of hypocrisy that has hit the floor of this House since I came here three months ago. It is absolutely unbelievable that the Liberal Party, which had in its midst one of the foremost recycling environmentalists from municipal government and ignored her completely, then turned around and said, “We will put a dump in your riding under the Environmental Protection Act.” This has got to be one of the most cynical turns of change that I have seen in a long time.

I would echo one of my fellow members that this is a shame. On the other part of this, “Since the present government has clearly abdicated its responsibility,” I would say that this government is the only government that has ever accepted its responsibility, and the only thing that is more stinking and obnoxious than the perfidy that has been perpetrated on the people of Pickering is the hypocrisy that is in this motion.

Mr Elston: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I know that the gentleman who just spoke is new to this House and you are newly in your chair, but people ought to be reminded that the use of the words “hypocrite,” “hypocrisy” or other things are unparliamentary and, in fact, he ought to be asked to withdraw those comments and apologize to the House.

The Acting Speaker (Ms Haslam): I agree and I am sure that the member would like to review his remarks with a view to withdrawing them.

Mr Wiseman: This topic is one that does rile me, and I am afraid I did get a little carried away. I wish to apologize for some of the comments that maybe I should not have made.

Mrs Fawcett: It is with a great deal of pleasure that I am able to participate in this debate on the environment and more specifically on waste management.

On 22 November the Minister of the Environment was asked by my good friend and colleague the member for Quinte to confirm that communities like Marmora will not be candidate sites for Metropolitan Toronto's garbage. The minister was unable to make that commitment. She instead only spoke about her reliance on reduction efforts in the hope that an emergency waste site will not be necessary. In her responsibility as the Minister of the Environment it is essential that she have plans in place to deal with Metro's waste if her reduction targets are not achieved, and I hope she is considering those.

I would like to refer to the statement I made on 2 May 1990. At that time I expressed very real concerns that constituents in the north and east portions of my riding have regarding the impending dangers should the Marmoraton mine site be chosen as a landfill for Metro Toronto's garbage. These residents are most concerned about the adverse effects this would have on the ground and surface waters. They are concerned enough that they have formed an organization, the Campbellford TNT, which stands for Campbellford Takes No Trash. This is a subgroup of the Marmora TNT, with which I am sure the member for Hastings-Peterborough is most familiar.

In fact, on 27 October members of the Take No Trash group met with the Minister of Agriculture and Food in his constituency office, where he stated that he is against Metro or anyone else using the Marmoraton mine site as a garbage dump in view of environmental problems. He claimed at that time that he had been speaking to the Minister of the Environment and that she was also in support of the TNT group's position.

1720

I too have spoken with the members of the TNT on numerous occasions and I am most supportive of their efforts to protect and preserve the environment. The Marmoraton mine site is a former open-pit iron ore mine. The pit is filling with water and is currently about half full. I might add that the water is stocked with several species of fish which are surviving very nicely. This water flows directly into the Trent, Crow and Moira rivers which in turn flow directly into Lake Ontario at the Bay of Quinte.

Members of the various TNT groups and myself are vehemently opposed to any suggestion that the Marmoraton mine site accept any garbage from the greater Toronto area or in fact anywhere. The suggestion that it be a potential site has been put forth to Metropolitan Toronto by Armbrust Materials and Construction Ltd and is currently being considered and pursued by both parties. I can tell the members the people of Marmora do not want Metro waste dumped in the Marmoraton mine site; they are not willing hosts. Even though it is estimated that the town could make \$3 million per year in tax revenues from taking Metro trash and it would create 100 new local jobs, they do not want it.

Speaking on behalf of the village of Marmora, their reeve, Andre Philpot, said: "The town won't take Metro's garbage even if it is paid in gold nuggets. They can pave

our streets with gold and put diamonds on the soles of our shoes, but they are not getting a dump here."

The devastating effect that the selection of this site would have on the communities bordering these waterways which are heavily dependent on the tourism industry would be insurmountable and irreparable. Not only that, but equally important are the adverse effects that the leachate would have on ground water which the residents of the area depend upon for drinking. This double whammy on the ground and surface water would totally destroy the agrifood industry, the major source of income for the entire area.

The current government must ensure that the preservation and maintenance of water quality throughout this province is a number one priority with it. I would suggest that they further explore effective ways to reduce, reuse and recycle and that the implementation of packaging laws be a major consideration in this as soon as possible.

I would also urge that when considering a site for GTA's garbage, they remember the farmer in Seymour township, the tourist operator in Campbellford, the families of the village of Marmora as well as the fishermen, both commercial and sport, in the Bay of Quinte and never ever allow the Marmoraton site to be an option for them. The GTA's garbage problem is a problem of tremendous proportions, but the solution cannot come at the expense of workers, families, business persons and farmers of eastern Ontario. If we are to pass our heritage on to our children and our children's children, our land, air and water quality must be protected.

Mr Stockwell: The fact of the matter is that the situation is the situation. There are only 20 in our caucus—the situation is the situation and that is where one finds oneself. I think trying to suggest to this House that the member did not know that the situation was the way it was is unreasonable. It is unfair and unacceptable.

The member who sits as the Minister of the Environment today knew that this was the crisis we were in. She was not totally uninformed of Metropolitan Toronto's position and situation when it came to disposing of its garbage. The difficulty she is facing is that the Premier pranced around the province promising people who had a waste site in their backyard that they were going to get a full environmental hearing. That is the difficulty she is faced with.

The difficulty is further enlarged for two reasons: One, she did not think she would get elected and she did. Two, she has all these promises out there that people believed. They believed that the NDP would give them a full environmental assessment hearing on all the sites. The fact of the matter is that even a 25% level of reuse, recycling etc will buy the minister six months of extension, and 50% will buy her 18 months of extension. The fact is that that kind of extension will not allow her to be in a position not in fact to open a new site somewhere. There has got to be an interim site in the next year or so that has to be started. The work has to start within the next year or so if it is going to be on stream soon enough for the waste to be dumped.

The suggestion is that everyone wants to chip in and help the minister. Well, I think everyone does want to chip in and help the minister. Everybody would like to see the recycling program work, everyone, including Metropolitan Toronto, Peel, the Conservatives and the Liberals, I am sure. But the statistics are the statistics, and they simply state that Metropolitan Toronto has 9.4 million tonnes of space left. They are producing at 265,000 tonnes per month. If the Ministry of the Environment directs the Britannia site to be diverted to the Keele Valley site, that loses another five months of space. That means that the minister is going to have to find a new site somewhere in late 1993 or early 1994. No question about it—she is going to have to find it, assuming she has a 25% recycling pro forma.

If she is assuming a 25% pro forma, then the only option for the member for Durham West at that point in time is to cross the floor to join the Conservatives, because they are going to have to open Whitevale and they are going to have to open it with no environmental assessment hearing at all, period. Not a day, not an hour, not a minute.

What is very curious is that the Environment minister stood up here today, and not once did she say “emergency powers.” Those words never came up. Why do they not come up? Because she would just as soon ignore the issue, not deal with it until the time comes when she is going to have to break all her promises. She should talk to the commissioner of works in Metropolitan Toronto. He has already suggested that she is going to run out of space by 1993 or 1994.

She can plan and plan all she wants. The fact of the matter is, if she diverts 25%, which is a bold goal, she has still got three million tonnes of waste per year coming from Metro, and she has only got nine million tonnes that she can dispose of. That gives her three years. She had better find something in the meantime.

To go on to make the suggestion that if we all chip in we can resolve the problem is a very good idea. Let's all chip in and we will try to resolve the problem. But the minister is going to have to tell us what the game plan is. No more rhetoric: we need to know the game plan. What is her commitment to dollars for recycling? What is her commitment to the municipalities with respect to the blue box program? How is she going to achieve these recycling goals that she has set out? She is not going to tell us.

If she wants the people to chip in, the least she could do is give them a look at the playbook. If she cannot give them a look at the playbook, maybe she could tell them when they can get a look at what the playbook says. If she cannot tell them when, maybe she can tell them when she can tell them when she can tell them what is in the playbook, because right now they have no idea.

The clock is running. It took two weeks for this minister to admit that there was a crisis. She lost two weeks worth of time to resolve the issue. It has now been three or four weeks we have been sitting in the House. We have lost three or four weeks of time to resolve the issue. All the time that we sit here talking about integrated systems, consultation and new committees, the clock keeps ticking.

Every time that clock ticks, the people of Durham are that much closer to a dump site. Every time that clock ticks, the people of Vaughan are closer to an expansion of Keele Valley. Every time that clock ticks, Metro's garbage crisis worsens, and it worsens to the point that the minister knows for a fact that when it comes to the time of 1993 or 1994, the emergency powers will be exercised. The die is cast. The people have not got an option. She will open sites without any environmental assessment hearings. She knows it, the Liberals know it, and we know it.

1730

She had better tell her caucus backbenchers so they can decide whose membership card they want to buy next year when it comes to political affiliation. The suggestion is made that the next time the Premier of this province goes out making promises—maybe it is good they found out this is the problem of being elected, because maybe he will not be running to every municipality making promises that are absolutely and totally impossible to keep. Maybe he will stop making promises that the garbage will in fact vanish.

We have not taken one thing into consideration, and that one thing is the miracle factor, because that is what she is going to need: The miracle factor. Come this time next year, the only thing that is going to save the minister's bacon is a miracle, and it is going to be a bigger miracle than happened on 6 September.

As we read through *An Agenda for People*, people are looking for a simple and just solution to a very controversial and difficult subject. The simple and just solutions she had three months ago the minister has either forgotten or they were just too simple and just not enough. This will come back to haunt the minister, it will come back to haunt the backbenchers, and it will come back to haunt her credibility on the campaign trail in five years.

Ms S. Murdock: I want to take this, my first opportunity, to congratulate everyone, and I welcome the opportunity to speak today against the Liberal motion.

As the member for Markham stated earlier today, there is not one person in this House who would not agree that the environmental concerns of this province are of prime importance. As more and more landfill sites reach capacity and as more and more delays in the process hold us back, we know full well that the responsibility for the protection and regeneration rests with us both as residents of this province and as legislators.

I will not be discussing Peel today or any of the other landfill sites mentioned. I would rather discuss the northern perspective, because I want it noted that we in the north have the same concerns as the rest of the province almost in every matter, but most especially in the environmental concerns and in landfill sites specifically. We are not shocked by any alleged naïveté of the Minister of the Environment. In fact, the statement that the minister has made is welcome to the people of the north.

Being a member from the north and being in the south these past few months, specifically sitting here for the past few weeks, has solidified the sense that waste management problems are simply confined to the south, and that is just

not the case. In my riding of Sudbury, three of our waste sites are nearing approved capacity and all three require either expansion or replacement. My regional municipality wants a clearly defined process for environmental assessment, but experience has shown thus far, and in the past it has shown conclusively, that to get a decision or an approval from the present environmental assessment system is almost impossible. We are very happy to see that the ministry's three-part plan includes review of and revision to the Environmental Assessment Act. To say that the present environmental assessment process has, and I use the minister's words here, "not always worked in the best interests of all concerned" is putting it mildly. The need for a speedy review is imperative.

We in the north are thrilled with the minister's announcement that making revisions to this act is a priority, while at the same time maintaining environmental safety. Northern communities have to be conservers to the same degree as our southern counterparts. Just because there is more space in the north does not mean that the rules change, nor does it mean we can continue to produce waste at the same runaway pace we are presently doing.

Moving waste by whatever means—I do not care whether it is rail or truck—is simply creating another environmental problem. What we have to do, all of us—and that is the north, the southeast and the west—is reduce. The whole issue of reduction has been introduced by the minister, and at long last there are provisions to reduce packaging, separate at source, educate us as conservers, and increase and expand municipal programs in the 3Rs.

The blue box program, which has yet to start in Sudbury—it is scheduled for the spring—is not enough. One has to reduce. If a family of five, as we have in my city, can reduce to less than half a bag of garbage a week, then it can be done by all of us.

There is no quick and easy solution, but it is plain to see that less garbage can be better managed. So no matter where we live in this province, reduction first is the key, then reuse and then recycle. The bottom line for all of us is protection of our environment.

Mr McClelland: It is with a great deal of interest that I participate in this emergency debate today. I have particular pleasure to participate in this debate with the new goddess of the environment. I notice that she blushed somewhat when her parliamentary assistant, the member for Riverdale, anointed her as the new goddess. I want to say to the member for Riverdale that I had the privilege of serving as parliamentary assistant, and I hope I showed appropriate deference to the minister at that time. I would also trust that in dubbing her today the goddess of the environment she will not end up being the goddess of garbage. I say that in all sincerity, because I think, as we stand here today and talk about a very serious situation, we have to recognize what may very well take place.

I fear a little what I am going to say here, because I find myself agreeing with the member for Etobicoke West. That gives me pause. But let me refer in the very short time I have to the situation in Brampton. I want to be very parochial, but I think that from the specific we can talk about the general.

The member for Durham West made comment about a former colleague of mine and the situation she faced in her riding prior to the election, the riding he now serves; I am sure he will serve it with enthusiasm and serve it ably as well. The member's predecessor had a situation similar to what he now faces in Whitevale and that I faced in Brampton with the proposed interim site 6B. Until a few weeks ago, the people in Brampton, who, interestingly enough, I will be meeting with this evening, believed that at least they were going to get an Environmental Protection Act hearing.

Some reference has been made today throughout the course of the debate by my friend the member for Mississauga South and others about the distinction between an Environmental Protection Act hearing and an Environmental Assessment Act hearing. Quite frankly—and I do not say this in a pejorative sense—I am not sure that a lot of people who talk about that difference really understand the distinction.

Let me say this in the short time we have: The people in Brampton North, particularly those close to site 6B, understood that they would rather in the normal course of events be afforded a full environmental assessment hearing. I think that goes without saying but needs to be said. Given the situation they were faced with, they were at least hanging on to the expectation that they would have an Environmental Protection Act hearing. I can say there is a great deal of opinion that says site 6B in Brampton may not have environmentally withstood the scrutiny of an Environmental Protection Act hearing. I think that is critical, because as my friend the member for Mississauga West says, we may never know.

My fear is this—it has been said and I will say it again—that with all of the plans, and I wish the minister every success, much was under way, and I am familiar with the draft plans and what is available from the very competent staff at waste management at the Ministry of the Environment.

1740

Our friend the member for Durham West talked about what other communities in other jurisdictions are doing. I wish the minister well in achieving that. I know she has committed herself in the past and will continue to do that.

But the people of Brampton are concerned about this, as they are in other parts of this province: What will happen when the day comes and she has not been successful—I hope she is—and she relies on her emergency powers? I think the folly—and I say this with respect to the minister—in what we have heard with respect to her plan is that we uphold any initiative that has begun with respect to the environmental hearing process.

One of the comments the minister made was that, if necessary, she would be prepared to rely upon the initial work. Time does not permit me to go into the initial work that was done. The minister will know that it was extremely flawed. There is no question that the initial work done in Brampton and Peel was extremely flawed and hence the order from the then minister, the member for St Catharines, to restart the process. What we have now is a difficulty where the process that was about to have been

restarted has been put on the shelf; we do not know where we are going to go. I say to the minister, as my friends have said today: Would she please tell us what she plans to do, what kind of environmental protection will be afforded the people of Brampton and other sites across this province when the day comes when we have waste and we do not have anywhere to put it?

Mr O'Connor: It is a great pleasure to speak today in the House as an MPP in a greater Toronto area riding and as the parliamentary assistant to the GTA minister. I would like to take this opportunity to speak in favour of the Minister of the Environment's statement on the environmental plan of action.

Ontario, especially the greater Toronto area, needs a comprehensive environmental plan, a plan of action that the minister spoke about in this House, the plan to change Ontario's 1980s consumer way of life into the 1990s consumer way of life.

It is essential that the GTA retains its quality of life for its inhabitants. I would like to share with the House a little information about the greater Toronto area. The GTA is a highly integrated urban complex. It contains five regional municipalities: Metropolitan Toronto, Halton, Peel, Durham and York regions, with 30 local municipalities. It has over 6,000 square kilometres, with approximately four million inhabitants and 1.4 million households. It is estimated that 2.4 million people work in this region; 44% of the population live here; 45% of Ontario's total employment base of about 4.2 million jobs; 40% of Ontario's gross provincial product of \$2.249 billion; and it uses less than 1% of Ontario's land area.

Just to get an idea of the enormous problem we are facing today, the GTA generates 4.3 million tonnes of waste every year. It would fill the SkyDome to the height of the CN Tower every year. Between 1967 and 1987, waste quantities requiring management in the GTA grew by 6% annually. The GTA municipal regions every year generate the following: Metropolitan Toronto, 2.5 million tonnes, 58% of the total; Peel region, one million tonnes, 17% of the total; York region, 0.5 million tonnes, 12% of the total; Durham region, 0.4 million tonnes, 8%; and Halton region, 0.2 million tonnes, 5% of the total waste.

The GTA generates the following waste: residential, 1.5 million tonnes, 35%; commercial, one million tonnes; industrial, one million tonnes, both at 22%; construction and demolition accounts for 0.2 million tonnes or 5%, leaving a miscellaneous amount totalling 0.6 million tonnes or 16%.

In 1989, 8.5% of the total waste generated by the GTA was diverted by application of the 3R principle in waste management. The estimated waste rates diversion for 1990 vary between 10% and 15%—obviously not enough. Today virtually all GTA municipalities have curbside recycling. Obviously it is not enough, though.

Many municipalities within the GTA also have special recycling programs for motor oil, white goods, leaves, yard brush and household hazardous wastes. Some municipalities recycle telephone books, batteries, tires, cloth and propane containers. Halton region has banned from disposal the following: newspapers, glass containers,

steel and aluminum cans, PET plastic bottles and old corrugated cardboard. All regional municipalities have banned the disposal of white goods, stoves and refrigerators. The disposal of wood waste in Peel region is prohibited. The municipalities are considering the disposal of drywall along with wood. Many industries and commercial establishments and institutions have in place recycling collection programs for old corrugated cardboard, fine paper, plate glass, glass containers, tires, oils, solvents, drums, metal, plastic, rubber and textiles. Hundreds of schools within the GTA are involved in the recycling of fine paper, steel and aluminum cans and newspapers.

As members can see, the problem that the GTA faces and the challenges regarding waste management are enormous. Good initiatives and programs are in place, but they are not enough. More must be done: a strong determination in the direction with firm priorities. As a society of waste generators, we must all, including legislators, citizens, business owners and operators, teachers and students—all consumers who drive this wasteful society—reconsider what resources are being eaten up as we feed our material appetite.

The Minister of the Environment and this government's planned announcement will shape a waste management policy that is beneficial for the people of Ontario, especially within the GTA. The government will develop plans and pursue conservation within our industry, commerce and private and public institutions. Our communities must return to a society that uses simple tools like lunch pails and milk jugs instead of throwaway containers.

Landfill is not the solution to this waste management crisis. The solution lies within the 3Rs priorities. Reduction is the key to the whole situation and I urge our communities and citizens within this House to support co-operation in this far-reaching effort. I know that in speaking with people within my riding, they assume responsibility as well. Reduction has to be paramount.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: On 21 November the Minister of the Environment made her waste management strategy announcement. As others have stated, she called for a reordering of the priorities of the 3Rs of waste management, an emphasis on reduction and reuse over recycling.

1750

This minister has also announced the establishment of a new public sector authority to deal with waste management problems in the GTA to search and select a waste disposal site. However, in the meantime waste continues to be produced. Landfill sites continue to be filled and no further announcements seem to be forthcoming from this minister as she plans to implement her ambitious if not incredible reduction plan. She has put all her eggs in one basket—reduction with no contingency plan in the event her reduction levels are not achieved. She presents only emergency orders as backup.

The minister is now in the perfect position to bring forward legislation calling for an aggressive reduction plan. Indeed, it is her responsibility to do so. Otherwise the feared garbage gap of 1993 will be there.

The NDP position has always been that the greater Toronto area should be responsible for finding sites for its own waste within its own boundaries and not be looking outside its boundaries. This minister now asks us to wait as we search and select. Regions like my own of Ottawa-Carleton are concerned with this government's current plans, or no plans, to deal with the GTA garbage crisis. They are concerned that the GTA does not deal with its own garbage crisis—eastern Ontario and Ottawa-Carleton are being asked to pick up Metropolitan Toronto's garbage against their will.

Only last week it was discovered that Laidlaw Waste Systems had been bringing construction waste from Toronto to Ottawa "for quite some time." Our region discovered much to our chagrin that Laidlaw was accepting at least 100 tonnes a day of construction waste and had indeed also received 1,900 tonnes of soil contaminated with oil and gasoline.

Our regional chair called on the member for Ottawa Centre to bring forward emergency legislation to allow the region to control foreign garbage. In answer, the member for Ottawa Centre's special assistant, the member for Oxford, said, "We think no one should have to take someone else's garbage unless they want it." That is the position the NDP had defended while in opposition. That principle seems to have gone completely by the wayside. When the Minister of the Environment was questioned in the House on 22 November she could not confirm—I repeat, not confirm—that only municipalities that were happy hosts or willing hosts would receive GTA waste. She only pledged that whatever site was found would be subject to the full environmental assessment.

Ottawa does not want Metro trash or garbage, as that only means that municipalities throughout eastern Ontario that use Ottawa's landfill site, such as Smiths Falls, Carleton Place or Lanark, will end up without a site much, much earlier than had been anticipated or planned. We in eastern Ontario are relying on this government to take waste management as a top priority, to develop meaningful, realistic strategies.

The problem in Ottawa is just the tip of the iceberg. As our regional chair has said, "The NDP government's decision on Wednesday, November 21, to scrap plans for two new, desperately needed Toronto area dumps will put more pressure on eastern Ontario to accept Toronto's garbage."

This is just unacceptable. It is simply unacceptable. We need leadership and direction in waste management from this Minister of the Environment. When will the specifics and time lines be presented to this House and to the people of Ontario? I ask that question.

The Speaker: Any other members? The member for Mississauga West.

Mr Mahoney: I believe they have a minute and some left, if they wish to use it.

The Speaker: Yes, but there was no one standing.

Mr Mahoney: They have to stand up to speak.

Mr Sutherland: When the Minister of the Environment was speaking earlier, she said that she hoped this

debate would bring about some constructive suggestions as to how all of us could work together to try to make sure that we had a good solution for the garbage crisis. Yet throughout the debate, whether it was the mover of the motion, whether it was the member for Markham or the member for Etobicoke West, all they talked about was how this plan was not going to work, yet none of them proposed an alternative plan.

Both the Tories and Liberals have talked this afternoon as if they are experts on garbage reduction, and they have talked about the minister and emergency powers. I want to remind the Conservatives about the people of southwest Oxford, who went through an environmental assessment that said the dump site should not be put there. The Progressive Conservative cabinet of the time overturned that decision. The former Premier promised that if he got elected he would overturn the Conservative decision, but he never delivered on that promise and we know where he is today. However, the people of southwest Oxford responded by implementing the first mandatory blue box recycling, long before the former government was even thinking about it, and today they have been able to extend their landfill site.

The point is that if we are really going to deal with a solution, everyone must be working together. We can no longer afford to point fingers. We have got to work together to find the solutions. The Minister of the Environment has proposed a plan; the other parties have not. That is the key difference.

Mr Mahoney: I think that member should be in cabinet, the way he stands up there and lets them have it. I think the member for Oxford should be right down, maybe in the Ministry of Labour. Maybe one of these guys would give up his \$27,000 and the limo.

Mr Bradley: It is \$32,000.

Mr Mahoney: I never got there. I am sorry, I did not realize how much it was. I am going to tell the Premier that the member ought to be down here just for a little spark. He might make the odd mistake, but I think we can live with that.

The new people in here must find it entertaining when they watch the Tories stand up and immediately turn over this way and start shouting at us. They do not know what happened on 6 September. They won. They are the new government.

Something that happens when you become the new government is, you get responsibility. It is really difficult to understand, but you are not over here any more shouting at us, telling us how we should solve the problems. Instead, what the Tories are doing is complaining about the last five years. In fairness, we always complained, and so did the New Democrats, about the previous 42 years, and these are legacies. What scares me, what frightens me, is the next 50 to 100 years, with the legacy that the government is going to leave to our kids with the kind of decisions being made by this Minister of the Environment.

This decision has totally abdicated her responsibility and the responsibility of this government to show

leadership in the areas of waste management. Instead, what has this government done?

Mrs Marland: Are you running for leadership?

Mr Mahoney: I am always running. The member knows that.

This government has simply told the regions and the people out there that they have got to find ways to reuse and to reduce. "Eat your chicken bones. Don't throw them in the garbage; eat them." That is what this government is telling the people: "Eat your garbage; reduce." The government should be realistic. The people out there on Friday morning, or whatever day it happens to be, put their garbage at the curbs.

The poor Treasurer, he only gets chicken bones. I understand that. They put their garbage at the curb and they come home from work on Friday night and guess what? They expect the garbage to go somewhere. Well, it is about time that we started educating them about where it goes and how we have to dispose of it.

The minute you get into office, the minute that you take on the most incredibly important portfolio in your government, that you stand up and say, "We are going to throw out the dump sites, we are going to throw out the environmental assessment process, we are going to throw everything out," then do members know what is going to happen? This guy up here, the member for Durham West, who is such a champion and believes in what great things the minister is doing, the day she stands up in the House and announces the dump is going there, he is going to jump right over the back of this House and he is going to run down the 401 calling: "Norah, you were right. Norah, save me; save me from my own party," with this

absolutely misguided platform that this government is putting forward without any positive leadership.

1805

The House divided on Mrs Sullivan's motion, which was negated by the following vote:

Ayes—53

Arnott, Beer, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Chiarelli, Cleary, Conway, Cordiano, Cousens, Cunningham, Daigeler, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Henderson, Jackson, Jordan, Mahoney, Mancini, Marland, McClelland, McGuinty, McLean, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, Offer, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, Poirier, Poole, Ramsay, Runciman, Ruprecht, Sola, Sorbara, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

Nays—67

Abel, Akande, Bisson, Boyd, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, Pouliot, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Swarbrick, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

The House adjourned at 1811.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, Chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Tuesday 4 December 1990

Members' statements

Automobile insurance	2361
Mr Chiarelli	
Public sector infrastructure	2361
Mrs Marland	
Royal Canadian Legion, Branch 635	2361
Mrs MacKinnon	
Race relations	2361
Mr Curling	
Hospital emergency services	2362
Mr Arnott	
Rail services	2362
Mr B. Ward	
Farm lands	2362
Mr Bradley	
Water supply	2362
Mrs Witmer	
Drinking water	2363
Mr Hope	

Statement by the ministry

Economic outlook	2363
Mr Laughren	

Responses

Economic outlook	2366
Mr Bradley	
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Cousens	
Mrs Marland	

Oral questions

Economic policy	2369
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Northern Ontario	2370
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Ramsay	
Layoffs	2371
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Laughren	
Non-profit housing	2372
Mr Harris	
Mr Cooke	
Gasoline prices	2373
Mr Callahan	
Mrs Carter	

Court system	2374
Mr Harnick	
Mr Rae	
Prescription drugs	2375
Ms Haeck	
Mrs Gigantes	
Political contributions	2375
Mr Scott	
Ms Lankin	
Religious education	2375
Mrs Cunningham	
Mrs Boyd	
Severance pay	2376
Ms Haslam	
Mr Mackenzie	
Health professions legislation	2376
Mr Phillips	
Mrs Gigantes	
Nuclear power	2377
Mr Jordan	
Mrs Carter	

First readings

Ontario Loan Act, 1990, Bill 9	2378
Mr Laughren	
Agreed to	2378
Corporations Tax Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 10	2378
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Agreed to	2378
Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 11	2378
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Agreed to	2378
Education Amendment Act (Miscellaneous), 1990,	
Bill 12	2378
Mrs Boyd	
Agreed to	2378
Ottawa-Carleton French-Language School Board	
Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 13	2378
Mrs Boyd	
Agreed to	2378
City of York Act, 1990, Bill Pr52	2378
Mr Rizzo	
Agreed to	2378

Opposition day

Waste management, motion 2	2378
Mrs Sullivan	2378
Mr Cousens	2381
Mrs Grier	2384
Mr Offer	2386
Mrs Marland	2386
Ms Churley	2388

Mr Sorbara	2389	Other business	
Mr B. Murdoch	2390		
Mr Wiseman	2390	Visitors	2377
Mrs Fawcett	2392	Mrs Marland	
Mr Stockwell	2392	The Speaker	
Ms S. Murdock	2393	Adjournment	2397
Mr McClelland	2394		
Mr O'Connor	2395		
Mrs Y. O'Neill	2395	Lists of members	
Mr Sutherland	2396		
Mr Mahoney	2396		
Negated	2397	Members and their responsibilities	2398

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 4 décembre 1990

Première lecture		Loi de 1990 modifiant la loi sur le Conseil scolaire	
Loi de 1990 sur les emprunts de l'Ontario,		de langue française d'Ottawa-Carleton,	
projet de loi 9	2378	projet de loi 13	2378
M. Laughren		Mme Boyd	
Adoptée	2378	Adoptée	2378



65 1990

65 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 5 December 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 5 décembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 5 December 1990

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

COUPURES BUDGÉTAIRES À RADIO-CANADA

M. Grandmaître : Je suis très inquiet des conséquences de ces importantes coupures budgétaires à Radio-Canada. Ces coupures ont fait l'objet d'une annonce aujourd'hui. Le gouvernement fédéral vient d'enlever aux francophones tout accès à l'information en français sur la vie de leur communauté. Ils n'ont plus d'autres choix que de se tourner vers les stations anglophones. Radio-Canada vient de perdre les moyens de remplir son mandat.

L'annonce de ces coupures survient un peu plus de trois mois après que le gouvernement libéral de l'Ontario ait annoncé que la chaîne française de TVOntario deviendrait désormais un service permanent parce qu'il jugeait qu'il s'agissait d'un outil de développement indispensable à la communauté francophone de l'Ontario. C'est un coup dur pour les francophones de l'Ontario et pour le Canada en général.

Je demande au ministre de la Culture et des Communications de l'Ontario de contacter, dans les plus brefs délais, son homologue fédéral pour discuter des mesures à prendre pour donner aux francophones de l'Ontario un service dont ils ont absolument besoin.

Après avoir donné le contrôle sur notre économie aux Américains, après avoir, à proprement parler, détruit le réseau ferroviaire Via, le gouvernement fédéral s'attaque à un autre élément essentiel de notre existence en tant que pays souverain. Non content de créer encore plus de chômage, il faut en plus que le gouvernement s'acharne sur un autre des outils essentiels de notre unité nationale.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr B. Murdoch: I would like to advise the Minister of the Environment and the House of an imminent emergency looming in my riding. The town of Meaford and the township of St Vincent realized some time ago that they would soon need a new garbage dump or an expansion of the present site to serve some 6,500 people who live in the area.

They decided, since the dump was almost full, that a new site would be the preferable way to go. They presented their case to the Environmental Assessment Board in hearings which lasted 106 days. The hearings ended months ago and they have received no decision.

This is a vital issue to the people concerned. To find a solution, the local government spent well over \$1 million to get permission to find a new dump site. The search is now ongoing.

The minister will, I hope, appreciate the gravity of this situation as garbage begins to pile up. Because the limit

has almost been reached, the ministry plans to close the dump shortly. I realize the minister is not responsible for the present drastic situation, but I would ask that she release the decision as quickly as possible so my constituents will know where they stand and can plan a course of action.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr White: Mr Speaker, I would like to first congratulate you upon your election.

I have the honour of representing the riding of Durham Centre, which is the urban part of Whitby and a good portion of north Oshawa, previously represented by Mr Furlong.

Today in the gallery there are a number of students from Paul Dwyer High School in Oshawa. Their presence reminds me of both my own political development from my youth and the idealism of such youth as we have with us today. I remember having been president of the political club in my high school in north Oshawa. That was before I came to the political convictions I have now. In 1968 I helped schedule assemblies for the entire school to hear political addresses. On one occasion we heard from our newly elected MP, Ed Broadbent. On another occasion we heard from the then Leader of the Opposition in Ontario, Robert Nixon, as I recall. There have been some changes in his career and in mine since that time.

The Chinese have a curse: "May you live in interesting times." I hope that the quality of our work here will reflect the need to incorporate the vision and idealism of youth with these interesting times and offer them an opportunity for real dialogue in our community.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORP CUTBACKS

Mrs McLeod: Although it is considered by some to be remote, Thunder Bay has the distinction of being the geographic centre of Canada. That means Thunder Bay, perhaps more than most places, understands the need for national links. We are neither east nor west and the connections with the eastern and western parts of our country are important to us.

We watched with great dismay as the last train pulled out of the Thunder Bay station last winter. We know what a devastating effect cuts to Via Rail had not only on our travel abilities but on our sense of being a nation linked from sea to sea.

The cuts which we now understand are to be made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corp today will have an equally devastating effect. The national fabric of this place we call Canada will be eroded. The regional material produced by local CBC stations is a vital component of Newsworld, the CBC's own news channel. Newsworld airs stories about Windsor produced in Windsor and stories

about Saskatoon produced in Saskatoon to the rest of Canada. The aspirations and concerns expressed by the people of Windsor or Saskatoon are then shared by the people of Canada.

The federal government must not allow these cutbacks to proceed.

KERRI MORROW

Mr Turnbull: It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise in the House today to pay tribute to a young constituent of mine. Kerri Morrow has been chosen as one of the 12 recipients of the 1990 Community Action Awards given by the Ministry of Citizenship and will be honoured at a special ceremony luncheon on Friday 7 December.

These awards recognize outstanding and significant work of individuals in the disabled persons community. Kerri has been a student at Don Mills Collegiate Institute since 1986, receiving resource room support for a learning disability. She is presently completing her Ontario credits and will enter university in the fall of 1991.

In addition to her academic work, Kerri has been active in many areas. She represented her school in swimming, water polo and orienteering, and served on the executive of the Don Mills athletic council.

She has been a peer tutor for students having difficulties with specific courses and last year worked closely with multihandicapped teens at Don Mills Middle School.

Kerri's assistance and support in academic, social and emotional terms has meant a great deal to her many friends and helped them immeasurably. She has more than repaid the support she herself received by giving so generously of her time and abilities to help others. It is fitting that these qualities are recognized, both as a tribute to Kerri and as an inspiration and encouragement to others.

I wish this young lady every success in the future and am sure she will achieve whatever goals she sets for herself. Congratulations, Kerri.

1340

ROBERT McDONALD

Mr Drainville: I wish to draw the attention of the House to the brave acts of Robert McDonald of Lindsay, in the riding of Victoria-Haliburton. Mr McDonald is a firefighter in the city of Etobicoke. On 17 February 1990 Rob and fellow firefighter Randall Murrell risked their lives to save a woman trapped in a house engulfed by smoke and flames. Crawling on their hands and knees, avoiding holes in the floor created by the fire, the two men found the elderly resident in the back bedroom. While Mr Murrell broke the bedroom window to create an escape route, Rob covered the victim with his body to protect her from shards of glass, heat and steam. His concern for the wellbeing of others was acknowledged by his peers when he was presented with the Ontario Firefighters' Award for Bravery this past November.

I am delighted to recognize the efforts of another Ontario resident who considers helping others important to his life and important to the community. We owe him a debt of gratitude.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORP CUTBACKS

Mr Mahoney: I wish to express my deep concern and the concern of my party over the CBC's decision to eliminate regional news and production facilities at CBET-TV in Windsor. The cutbacks will have a significant impact on the people of Windsor and Essex county.

CBET is a vital source of local and regional news in a television market that is dominated by signals from Detroit-based stations. Only one daily newspaper covers the area, and the CBC's decision means that people who do not subscribe to cable TV will no longer have access to a television station that broadcasts local and regional news.

The decision is also a severe blow to the regional economy. More than 100 CBC employees will lose their jobs at a time when the federal government's free trade and high interest rate policies are already causing severe economic problems in southwestern Ontario.

We have written to federal Communications Minister Marcel Masse to demand that he restore Canadian television service to Windsor. We are also demanding that the Minister of Culture and Communications meet with his federal counterpart to discuss the impact of the CBC cuts in Ontario. On behalf of the member and all members in our party, I would like to encourage the minister to demand that funding be restored.

TORONTO WATERFRONT

Mrs Marland: On 28 November the federal government announced its long-awaited decision on the fate of Harbourfront. The announcement mirrored the plan drafted by Duncan Allan, the Liberals' special adviser, a year ago. The assets of the corporation are to be sold to create an endowment fund for Harbourfront's successful cultural programs.

The problem lies in the fact that the \$80-million endowment fund will generate an income of only \$8.8 million a year. Harbourfront has indicated that it needs \$10.7 million to maintain the current level of arts and recreation programming. Harbourfront is left with a shortfall of \$2 million immediately and, as the plan offers no protection from inflation, this shortfall will continue to grow.

If we want to maintain the current programming, attended by some 3.5 million people a year, then Harbourfront will have to get additional funding from the three levels of government. Darcy McKeough advised Harbourfront to "go on bended knee" to beg for funding. Given the recent history of arts funding in this country, this advice seems to mark the demise of some programming.

I have to ask the Premier if this is the best deal for the people of the greater Toronto area. We will still get a wall of high-rises on the other side of Queen's Quay, and we will have no protection for the wonderful family-oriented programming down at the lakeshore. I can only hope that he will not marginalize culture in this province to those who can afford a Phantom of the Opera ticket.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr Perruzza: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to be able to address this assembly, and congratulations on your election as Speaker of the House.

Downsview riding traditionally is a blue-collar, working-class riding which is heavily dependent on the construction industry. I have to tell members that the previous Liberal government neglected, abandoned and ignored Downsview through its housing policies and through its transportation policies. Now the federal Conservative government has taken Downsview by the throat and is squeezing the lifeblood out of this riding through its high interest rate policy.

One of the most serious problems this riding is facing is high unemployment. I am very optimistic and proud of the statement that was issued by the Treasurer yesterday in suggesting that nearly 14,000 construction-related jobs are going to be created by this government over the next little while. This gives Downsview hope, hope in this government, hope in the future, one it did not have before. I applaud the Treasurer and his initiative.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

CHILD AND FAMILY SUPPORT

Hon Mr Hampton: This afternoon we will be introducing amendments to the Support and Custody Orders Enforcement Act, 1985, which will now be known as the Child and Family Support Act. These changes will have a significant impact on child poverty and the payment of support orders.

This government believes that we must fight child poverty. This is our intention. The payment of support is both a moral and legal responsibility.

Currently, 75% of support orders filed are in default. Only 25% are in compliance. Frankly, this level of compliance is unacceptable. We must do better.

The consequences of unpaid child support for recipients and their children are devastating. There are now 81,000 orders filed with the program. These orders touch the lives of 100,000 children. Only 20,000 of these cases are receiving all of the support moneys owing to them; \$334 million is owing to support recipients and their children and the case load grows by 1,200 new cases every month.

Without a change in the way we do business, the problem of unpaid child support orders and child poverty will continue to grow. This government is committed to making the child and family support program an effective way to help fight child poverty.

The legislation we are introducing today, once proclaimed, will provide for the collection of child support by means of automatic deduction from income. This change will mean that more support orders will be effectively enforced and will speed up the payment of child support.

At the time a support order is made, the court will also make an order requiring payment by way of deduction from income. This order will be immediately forwarded to the child and family support office, which will serve the employer with the order. The employer will be required to

deduct the amount of the support payment and forward it to the child and family support office for prompt distribution to the support recipient. This procedure is similar to the way income tax is collected through payroll deduction and will be just as effective.

1350

The amendments we will introduce will apply to all new court orders made in Ontario. The plan will also be available for cases already filed and for domestic contracts upon the request of the support recipient or where the child and family support office considers this to be the most practical enforcement option.

This approach removes the social stigma of a garnishment order. Support deduction will be the way most orders will be paid. It will become the social norm and will be seen as the optimum way for support payers to honour their court-ordered obligations to their children.

An important feature of this plan is that it is portable and moves with the support payer when there is a change in employment.

As well as this legislative change, the child and family support program is taking additional measures to deal with the current backlog. For example, specialized teams of enforcement personnel will be added to reduce the backlog of unenforced orders. We will also increase the automation of various enforcement processes and work towards increasing communications with support recipients to find out essential information which is necessary for successful enforcement actions.

In addition, public awareness of the massive problem of unpaid child support is a critical factor for a successful child support program. The Ministry of the Attorney General will be launching a public awareness campaign. It will begin shortly and will be aimed at informing the public about the serious problem of child support default and child poverty. Our goal is to change the way society views the importance of paying child support and make it clear that not paying support affects us all. Most importantly, failure to pay support condemns many children to a life of poverty.

These initiatives on their own will not solve the social problem of support default and child poverty. It is up to each of us, as members of the greater community, to make it clear that the failure to pay child support is simply unacceptable. It is up to all of us to work towards changing attitudes among spouses, peers, friends and co-workers. Together, we can make it happen.

MANITOULIN LAND CLAIM SETTLEMENT

Hon Mr Wildman: The commitment of the government of Ontario to deal fairly and justly with the people of the first nations living in Ontario has never been stronger than it is today. The throne speech stated our goals. Our government is determined to take major steps in negotiating aboriginal self-government, resolving historical grievances and improving the quality of life for aboriginal peoples in Ontario. This is not an easy task. We cannot redress hundreds of years of neglect and wrongdoing overnight, but we can move forward quickly and significantly on a number of fronts. We can, in partnership with the first

nations, correct historic injustices. We can improve living conditions for thousands of native people. We can negotiate and implement a variety of self-government structures.

I am pleased to inform the House today that we have already taken significant steps. Today, the government of Ontario has finalized its first land claim settlement. Earlier, I joined the chiefs of five first nations from Manitoulin Island to sign the agreement that will make \$7.2 million available to the first nations for economic development and land acquisition as well as some \$1.6 million worth of land.

Today in the Speaker's gallery we have with us Chief Patrick Madahbee of the Ojibways of Sucker Creek, Chief Max Assinewai of Sheguiandah First Nation, Chief Stewart Roy of the West Bay First Nation, Chief Norma Fox Wagosh of the Cockburn Island First Nation and Chief Joseph Endenawas of the Sheshegwaning First Nation.

Members of this House will remember that the previous government attempted to resolve this matter last July. Unfortunately, at the last moment one first nation decided not to participate. Five first nations did sign on that historic day. That agreement expired last Saturday, however.

Today, the five first nations have signed a final agreement. This agreement now provides for a portion of the funds to be held in trust. This trust fund will provide the basis for a settlement for the descendants of the South Bay West First Nation if its representatives choose at some future date to negotiate.

Briefly, the background of this claim is as follows. The first nations of Manitoulin Island surrendered their land in 1862 to the crown to be sold for the benefit of the first nations. Some 80,000 acres were unsold, however, and the first nations never received compensation for that land. This land is the subject of the land claim settlement today which was negotiated by the United Chiefs and Councils of Manitoulin and the government of Ontario.

Ontario has entered into this agreement without the participation of the federal government. That government disclaims any responsibility for the unjust situation. Ontario has accepted its responsibilities. We now leave it to the first nations to take any redress against the government of Canada.

Later today I will introduce legislation to empower Ontario to transfer some of the unsold surrendered lands to the first nations and to implement the agreement. Some of the land will be available to municipalities for development, and clear title to other portions of the land will remain with the government of Ontario.

As I said, this is the most recent action of my government. Earlier in October we offered land and assistance for the creation of the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation communities in northern Ontario. As well, we have offered additional land to Long Lake Number 58 First Nation.

Last week I joined representatives of Canada and Quebec and the Mohawks of Akwesasne in signing a five-year, \$25-million agreement for Akwesasne. That agreement will provide for a range of facilities for that community. These facilities are some that we take for

granted, including a community arena and a home for the elderly, for example.

Last Wednesday I was in Thunder Bay for the signing of the interim measures agreement with the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation. That agreement recognizes the inherent interest of NAN and NAN communities in the lands and natural resources on their treaty areas. I was pleased to announce that Dr Robert Rosehart, the president of Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, will be Ontario's chief negotiator in the self-government negotiations with NAN, which will begin early next year.

Ontario is also committed to making major improvements in the land claims process under the auspices of the Indian Commission of Ontario.

I have not achieved this progress on my own. I would like to acknowledge that these were initiatives of the previous government. In particular, I would like to give credit to my predecessor, the former minister responsible for native affairs, the member for St George-St David, and I would like to compliment him for his foresight and leadership.

Now it is my turn to go further.

I would like to assure this House that we are approaching the matter carefully. We are consulting extensively with the first nations and aboriginal peoples of this province, including those who live off-reserve, in order to clearly define and agree upon a new government-to-government relationship.

I look forward to announcing further progress towards our goals.

The Speaker: I wish to extend a very warm welcome to our special guests this afternoon from all members of the assembly here. We are certainly honoured with your presence and we trust that you will enjoy what unfolds from here.

1400

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Hon Mr Cooke: As Minister of Municipal Affairs, I intend to introduce legislation this afternoon to make the Ontario municipal election process more accessible to more people and to make campaign fund-raising and spending more accountable.

Many of these changes were included in legislation introduced in the last session but not passed by the last Legislature. I would like to draw to the members' attention some of the important additions we have made to the previous bill. In particular, our legislation will give the vote to people who have often been excluded from the democratic process.

Homeless people, for example, have been disfranchised by the current system. The Municipal Elections Act requires voters to have a permanent residence in a municipality or to own or rent property in it. The current definition of residence means that anyone without a fixed address cannot vote. The amendments I will be introducing today will provide new ways for people without a fixed address to meet residency requirements and thus be able to vote in the municipal elections.

Our legislation will also make it easier for students and residents of psychiatric hospitals to vote. Current legislation requires a municipal enumeration in May for elections in November. The changes I am introducing today will require a supplementary enumeration in mid-September of each year for students in universities and colleges and for patients in psychiatric hospitals.

The members may recall some of the other amendments introduced last June, many of them concerning the way election campaigns are financed.

The new legislation will require candidates with left-over campaign funds to turn the money over to the municipal clerk, who will hold it in trust for use during the next municipal election. Candidates will also be allowed to apply surplus campaign funds against past election debts. They will not be permitted to spend campaign funds on anything but legitimate campaign expenses.

Current legislation places a \$750 limit on the amount a contributor can give to any one candidate. The amendments I will introduce today will also limit to \$5,000 the total amount a single contributor can give to all candidates running for the same municipal council or school board or local board.

The legislation also addresses the enforcement of campaign financing and reporting rules. Currently, individual electors have to take legal action themselves if they believe the law has been broken. The new legislation would make the municipality, school board or local board responsible for acting on a complaint from an elector. If the municipality or board fails to act, the provincial Commission on Election Finances will be able to intervene.

Other amendments would allow municipalities to provide election information in languages other than English and French and to provide an alternative form of ballot for the benefit of the visually impaired electors.

The credibility of any government starts with the way in which it is elected. That is why the election process must be as fair and open as we can make it. These amendments will be a big step towards that goal. I look forward, with the opposition members, to developing over the next couple of years more extensive rules that will further reform the election expenses process.

RESPONSES

CHILD AND FAMILY SUPPORT

Mr Sorbara: I have read with interest the statement of the Attorney General today. Let there be no mistake about it, the amendments that he proposes to the current law are very far-reaching. What they will do in fact is give the agency that he refers to the right—the obligation, in fact—to require all employers to automatically deduct funds at source, from the paycheques of the employees who are subject to an order for support, and for those funds to be forwarded through the office that he is responsible for to the beneficiary of the support. This is a very important measure because of the very defaults that he referred to. Indeed, our government only months ago was considering a plan upon which the plan of the Attorney General is based.

But there is a shocking deficiency in the announcement he made today. If I might just expand, I want to say at this point that I hope it is a problem of drafting in this statement. He says here that this plan “will provide for the collection of child support by automatic deduction from income.” There was a time when the plans of the Ministry of the Attorney General were being prepared for automatic deduction for all those who were the beneficiaries of orders for support. I ask the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women’s issues, if the statement is correct, why we have ignored those thousands and thousands of women who were going to be able to rely on this system. I would like the Attorney General to say as soon as possible that this statement about child support really means support for all of those who are the beneficiaries of those systems.

I might also say that in his statement he refers to automation that will soon be implemented in the office. I just want to tell the members that the automation was undertaken by the previous Attorney General and is well under way to being fully implemented.

MANITOULIN LAND CLAIM SETTLEMENT

Mr Scott: I would like to congratulate my colleague and friend the minister responsible for native affairs on the completion of the four initiatives he has announced today. I should begin by saying, for my own part, that these four initiatives alone, although they may have limited rather than global impact, would have been enough for my political career and I am very proud of having played a part in initiating them.

None of these things is easy and I want to congratulate the minister and the government of which he is a member for having early brought the details of these important initiatives to completion. I also want to thank the minister—I am sure this will not go on for long—for the very kind things he had to say about me in his statement. I do not want it to go on for long. I have a riding to defend and the minister will understand that.

I only want to make one observation. As the minister will understand perfectly, the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation agreement is a trailblazing agreement and the minister will understand that, having announced it, he will want to be certain that there are available to the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation resources to implement it effectively and that there is some procedure for building in third-party interests in the exercise. Overlooking of these interests can from time to time be easy, but at the end of the day it is not productive. I know the minister will have that in mind.

I would also like to congratulate the chiefs, one of whom remains present. I know that he will convey to his colleagues my admiration for the part they have played in this exercise.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Mr Mahoney: I would like to respond to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and to congratulate him for bringing forward yet another piece of Liberal government legislation. It seems to be the order of the day for the New Democratic Party to simply recycle all of the good works

that were done by people here when they were there. I thank him for doing that and for recognizing for all the people in Ontario the good work that our government did.

I would only caution the minister, though, in the area of costs. Those people over there had for years criticized government for passing on certain responsibilities and items, particularly costs, to other levels of government. I think this minister should address any increased costs that might accrue to the municipalities, which are facing double-digit tax increases. The minister knows—and if he does not know, he should know—that the taxpayers out there at the municipal level are fed up with the increases that are being passed on to their councils, so would he please address that issue.

CHILD AND FAMILY SUPPORT

Mr Harnick: In response to the introduction of the amendments by the Attorney General, I would like to congratulate him and also to indicate that this problem, if not dealt with quickly, was going to expand to the point where these outstanding judgements would never be able to be enforced. My congratulations to the Attorney General for moving quickly on this area.

But there is another side to the equation; that is, support and custody orders also have the element of access, and I hope that the government will move quickly in the area of access and resolve those problems as well.

1410

MANITOULIN LAND CLAIM SETTLEMENT

Mr Harnick: I would also like to respond to the minister responsible for native affairs. On behalf of my party, I would like to extend my congratulations to the government and to previous governments for finally reaching an agreement on a matter which has been outstanding for some 128 years and under negotiation for 10 years. I look forward to the government working out an acceptable arrangement with the people of the South Bay West band so that all claims on Manitoulin Island may be settled and the people there can get on with rebuilding their communities.

Today is also a big day. It is a big day not just because it is the first claim settled by the provincial government but also because it is the first claim negotiated under the 1986 federal Indian lands agreement. As such, it sets a precedent for future negotiations nationwide.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Mr B. Murdoch: I would like to address the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I want to commend him on bringing this forward, although it has been pointed out it was Liberal legislation. There were a lot of problems with it and, as a municipal politician, I did have some concerns with the legislation as it sat before and now he has added some more amendments to it.

One of the things that will be interesting is how we are going to enumerate the homeless, and I will be interested to see how the minister is going to do that. I also hope he is going to allow this side of the House some more input into this. As I said before, there were some concerns with the old legislation and now with the new amendments,

which I believe look fairly well on the paper that he has written. It is just that we do have some concerns and I do hope that there will be some time for some input into this.

ADVERTISING BY MEMBERS

Mr Mahoney: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to raise a point of order and refer it to you for a ruling if I might.

I have here the Handbook on Constituency Office and Travel and Accommodation Expenses before me and, if you will indulge me very briefly, it reads on page 7: "A member may not use a constituency office to further the member's partisan political activities, including"—one of many things—"display of partisan, politically oriented signs."

It then goes on to say on page 8:

"Members can advertise to convey the following information: constituency office hours, telephone number, location. Advertising may also announce special events or give greetings from the member. The assembly does not fund advertising which"—among other things—"promotes riding associations or political party activities" or "portrays political party affiliation."

That is a Legislative Assembly document.

Unfortunately, in talking about standards for municipal politicians or others, and perhaps the Premier has corrected this problem, I have here the Peterborough Examiner of 2 November where there is an ad, with the Ontario coat of arms, placed in the name of Jenny Carter, NDP, Peterborough. I also have a photograph of a constituency office sign, which I would like to give to you to take into account in your ruling, of Mike Cooper, MPP, Kitchener-Wilmot, and it has the NDP logo attached to that sign. All this is paid for by the taxpayers.

The Speaker: The member for Mississauga West will understand that, strictly speaking, what he has raised is not a point of order, but I am pleased, of course, to consider the subject material and to deal with it appropriately and I will report back to him.

ORAL QUESTIONS

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr Conway: My question is to the leader of the government and it concerns the antirecession package which has been outlined by his government.

As the Premier will know, the recession deepens and unemployment rises, Ontario faces perhaps the worst winter in a decade. Can the Premier confirm that it is the policy of his government under the recently announced capital projects initiative to commit and spend but \$41 million in the winter of 1990-91?

Hon Mr Rae: I can confirm that the \$41 million which the Treasurer referred to yesterday in his statement is that money which we are allocating right away. As I said in answer to his colleague the Leader of the Opposition, who is seated next to him, if we can move other projects up sooner, if we can bring them on more quickly, we will do so. The \$41 million figure is a minimum. We are doing

what we can to bring others on stream as quickly as we can. That is the commitment of the government.

Mr Conway: Can the leader of the government further confirm data which were not provided by the government yesterday in the Treasurer's statement but which were provided by Treasury officials, and that is that of the \$41 million to be spent in this the very bad winter of 1990-91 but \$5.3 million will be spent in eastern Ontario and but \$6.9 million will be spent for all of southwestern Ontario?

Hon Mr Rae: No. First of all, I think it is important to stress that the \$700-million package is not the only money that is being spent anywhere in the province. There are in fact a large number of other projects that we are attempting to bring on stream that have been the subject of proposals coming from individual ministries. Those are coming on. We have other proposals that are under way with respect to both eastern Ontario and southwestern Ontario.

I want to stress to the member for Renfrew North that the figures which are being put forward are a minimum, that they are part of the capital works package only and that there are significant other moneys which are flowing now and which we are doing our very best to bring forward as quickly as we can with respect to additional investment.

I just want to stress to the member that the numbers which he is talking about are a minimum only. They are not the beginning and end of what we are trying to do. We are trying to bring other projects on stream as quickly as we can and that is the situation.

Mr Brown: Last week I attended a forest association meeting. They told us that there were 3,000 people out of work in northern Ontario in the forestry industry. We also understand that in the mining industry the numbers are at least as bad.

In a rather unorthodox announcement yesterday, the Premier stated that \$20 million of his plan would be expended in northern Ontario. It is ironic to me that last Friday he opened a \$23-million building in Sudbury which was one of only several major Liberal government projects in northern Ontario. By the Premier's own estimate, \$20 million in capital expenditure will mean about 400 one-year jobs in northern Ontario.

Does the Premier think he can he stand in this House and tell the people of Ontario, the people of northern Ontario and the members of his own caucus that this is an adequate response to what in northern Ontario in many places is not a recession but a depression?

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the question from the member for Algoma-Manitoulin. I really do. I want him to know that I am very much aware, as aware as I possibly can be, of the difficulties that are being experienced across the north. The layoffs which he has mentioned, somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 workers affected in the sawmill industry, are devastating. The announcement we have made with respect to the \$700 million is not the only announcement that is going to be forthcoming from the government at all with regard to northern Ontario or with regard to sawmill workers.

I want to indicate to the member that I have already indicated very clearly to the Prime Minister that Ontario wants to join with the industry and with other provinces in ensuring that the 15% export tax comes off. If that means our being together and facing the arguments in the United States, I think all of Canada wants to join together to say that the 15% export tax is unfair and should be removed. I have indicated that very clearly to the Prime Minister on behalf of the government of Ontario, and I am sure I have the support of all members when I say that.

With respect to the changes and the very difficult circumstances in the sawmill industry, that is the first step we are taking. The dollar has an impact, interest rates have an impact, but the government is also considering further proposals and, when we have them, we will be announcing them to the House. We are very much aware of the problem that has been described by the member.

1420

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mrs Y. O'Neill: My question is to the Minister of Revenue. In An Agenda for People, her party stated that Ontario would lead a national tax revolt against Mulroney's goods and services tax. Yesterday in Ottawa, her leader, along with all the national NDP leaders, reiterated this pledge.

The GST is being implemented in exactly 27 days. Can the minister please stand and tell this House exactly what she as the Minister of Revenue has done to initiate this tax revolt? How many times has she met with her federal counterpart to discuss this very pressing issue? How and when will the minister initiate this revolt?

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: Our party has participated in a so-called revolt. We are participating with the British Columbia and Alberta governments in a lawsuit with the retail sales tax, the GST and how it has been implemented, with the Constitution and stacking of the Senate. We also are doing Bill 1, which is going to be debated later this afternoon, by not stacking the GST on to the RST, as the member's government was planning to do. We are putting \$500 million back into the consumers' pockets.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think that could be interpreted as somewhat of a misty revolt, a hazy revolt. The minister does not seem to appreciate her own Premier's promise on this very issue. The Premier had made the fight against the GST one of his top priorities across this province throughout the past summer. The Treasurer has said as recently as yesterday that the GST is one of the main contributors to the recession. The Minister of Revenue's party has stated over and over clearly that it intends to lead a national revolt. Many of the members said that in their own ridings.

As the minister knows, a tax revolt traditionally means withholding payment to the Department of National Revenue. Initiating a form of protest such as a tax revolt is most serious, and indeed perhaps is the most important promise that the Premier has made to date. Given that there are 27 days left, as I have already said, until the GST takes effect, can the Minister of Revenue tell us exactly

what she is going to do to honour her leader's promise to start a tax revolt against the GST?

Will the minister be recommending that the people of Ontario withhold their tax payments to the Department of National Revenue for this year and the year to come, 1991? The people of Ontario want to know what specific initiatives or direction she is going to give them on this promised revolt. I am asking the minister for specific initiatives.

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: We are not stacking the GST on to the RST and we are not collecting the GST for the federal government, so it will be responsible for collecting its own GST. We will not be participating in that process with it.

Mr Mahoney: I would like to ask the minister if she is aware of just one of the implications of her GST bill which she has introduced in this House. Bill 1, her bill to harmonize the provincial sales tax with the GST, will repeal sales tax exemptions for investment in manufacturing production equipment and machinery. It allows the minister to make new policy by regulation at a later date if she so chooses.

The Quebec government has already exempted Quebec firms purchasing production equipment and machinery from provincial sales tax. The minister's GST removes this exemption for Ontario firms purchasing production equipment and machinery. Her bill places Ontario companies employing Ontario workers at a significant competitive disadvantage in the middle of a recession, if not a depression.

When will the minister act to ensure that the NDP government does not penalize Ontario companies and workers in the face of the GST?

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: Because the excise tax will be removed when the GST comes into force—as we all know, it probably will come into force on 1 January—we had to make these regulations there. Otherwise, they will not be covered, and we are by no means harmonizing, as they are doing in Quebec.

RENT REVIEW

Mr Tilson: I have a question for the Minister of Housing. Many of us have now had an opportunity to read the transcript from his appearance on the CBC Radio Noon program last Friday, when a carpenter from the Timmins area advised him that he had undertaken extensive renovations to his building, including \$40,000 from the low-rise rehabilitation program and an additional \$110,000 of his own money. The minister will recall that he has since been informed by his staff that his rents are now frozen. He also told the minister that he would go bankrupt because of his policies.

In the minister's answer, he implied that he should not have purchased such a neglected building in the first place and that its previous owners should have kept the building. The minister also admitted that it is impossible to write a law that covers everyone.

This is quite an unbelievable admission for a minister of the crown to make. Does he have any more advice for this man and any other people like him?

Hon Mr Cooke: I think what I indicated to the individual, as I have to other people as we have been discussing the new temporary rent regulation system, is that when somebody is going to invest in a building that has not been taken care of, has experienced years of neglect, it should not then be a system that rewards those years of neglect by allowing huge increases in rents for people across the province.

I would think that the member would be advocating, as I would be, that landlords should be taking care of their buildings and keeping them in a good state of maintenance. They should not be allowed to deteriorate and then be flipped, with huge rent increases going on to the tenants and the tenants paying for years of neglect. That is the system the member is advocating. I am not.

Mr Tilson: Let's try another one. I have another example of an apartment building owner who fears he will go bankrupt.

Amile Kassam owns a building at Sheppard Avenue and Keele Street. He borrowed money from a bank to undertake \$1.3 million of repair work. This amount includes \$200,000 for the repair of an underground parking garage to comply with a municipal work order. It also includes \$700,000 for new windows, because an engineering firm told the owner that the only way to deal with the problems of draughts and condensation was to install energy-efficient windows, and I am sure the Ministry of Energy would be pleased to hear about that. Finally, the owner replaced the roof and installed a new heating system. This can hardly be categorized as the luxury renovation described by the minister earlier in the House.

The owner who invested in this building and invested in these renovations did so in good faith, and he has no way to recoup his money and no way to repay the bank loan. Will the minister tell us whether this situation is fair?

Hon Mr Cooke: First of all, I want to make sure the member understands very clearly that we are not freezing rents in this province. He knows as well as I do that there is an increase in this year and there is an increase next year. I believe very strongly, and this government believes, that the rents that are being paid by tenants across this province should be going towards maintenance and upkeep of buildings. That is what rents are for.

Now, if the member is advocating, as he seems to be by his question, that when a work order has been issued by a municipality, and in fact when that work order is carried out, the tenant should pay for a repair that has obviously been a result of neglect, he and I totally disagree on that approach.

1430

Mr Tilson: I do not think the minister realizes what he has done. In effect he has banned renovations from this province.

I have another question. He has not done very well on the first two; let's try a third. This one involves an apartment owner who played by the rules and initiated necessary repair work in January 1990. Tina Schickedanz owns three buildings at Bayview and Cummer that are between 20 and 25 years old. She spent \$1 million to overhaul an

elevator, replace plumbing, a boiler and cracked plaster. She filed an application on 1 September 1990, before the current government was elected, but because the first effective date of the increase is 1 December 1990, she will not be able to recover one dime of these expenditures.

Could the minister tell the House why he feels it is fair to change the rules without notice and whether he will consider removing the retroactive feature from the bill.

Hon Mr Cooke: What we indicated before the election, during the election and after the election was that this party believed in better protection for tenants. That is what we have delivered on. I cannot believe that a member of the Legislature would come here today and say that because a landlord spent money on fixing cracked plaster, that should result in increased rents for tenants. The member should give me a break.

TUITION FEES

Mrs Cunningham: I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities, my colleague from the opposite side of the House in the former government. I am happy to be asking him this question today.

On Monday, in response to the recovery plan presented to the minister by the Council of Ontario Universities, the Premier appeared to immediately shoot down the proposal for higher tuition fees with enhanced student assistance for those students in need by stating, "That's not something we're considering." Is that quote an accurate reflection of the minister's position on tuition fees?

Hon Mr Allen: I must say I welcome the question from the member. I know she is very concerned about university issues. She has a university in her own constituency, as indeed do many members of the Legislature. She knows very well the extreme difficulties of the funding problems of those institutions over recent years and that they have put forward a plan to me to recover what amounts to a \$410-million loss, in effect, over the last 12 years. If those institutions were today funded at the rate at which they were in 1978, when another government was in power, they would have to be funded at \$410 million more today than they now receive. That presents this government with a very serious and difficult problem, especially in a time of recession and financial difficulty.

I cannot tell the member that this is my position with respect to fee increases, which were a central part of the recovery plan, because I have not yet sat down with my colleagues in this government to adopt a position. When I am in a position to tell her, I will indeed inform this House together about where we stand with respect to a recovery plan that might or might not include fee increases.

Mrs Cunningham: My observation then is that the Premier apparently has one position and the minister has another. Since the minister has not consulted with the rest of his colleagues in the cabinet, perhaps he could tell us what he will be advising them to do.

Hon Mr Allen: Perhaps I could say to the member that the Premier and I can never have a different position on this issue, by definition.

The fact of the matter is that I have welcomed this proposal from the representatives of the Council of Ontario Universities, because it seems to me there are some very critical questions that have to be in debate in public around the question of funding universities. There is no agreement between the faculty and the student bodies on the one hand and the administration and the presidents on the other on this particular issue, so I welcome the debate. I have myself invited all those parties in the universities to sit down in a week and a half with me to discuss this out among themselves and with myself as to how we can best devise a recovery plan for the universities of this province.

Mrs Cunningham: Of course the minister will remember that on this side of the House we try to influence the government's position as much as possible, and that is what I am trying to do today. Since the government appears not to be too warm towards the Council of Ontario Universities with its plan for the underfunding of our universities, that is, that tuition fees be part of the solution—part of the solution, I underline—could I then ask the minister what his government's solution will be in looking at the real problems that all of us face today, in today's world, with this crisis of overcrowded classrooms, outdated laboratory equipment, cancellation of library subscriptions and the other very large classes of third- and fourth-year students at all universities across the province of Ontario. If this is not part of his solution, what would his solution be?

Hon Mr Allen: I would have preferred that the solution had started 15 years ago with another administration. I would have preferred that the solution had begun with another administration that was in power over the last five years. Both of those governments left the university system in ninth place out of 10 in the average per student grant assistance across this country. We have a lot of recovery to make up.

I respect the presidents of the universities who came to see me and put forward a very innovative, long-range plan, in which the moneys that we would give to them would be committed to a trust fund in which they would have to account for every dollar, and every dollar would have to be spent on quality improvements and instruction. I thought that was a very imaginative proposal. I am sitting down with all the players in the system to ask how we can all best address those issues. I know the member will want to hear at as early a date as possible our response to that particular proposal.

DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED

Mrs McLeod: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. I understand that last Friday and Saturday the minister at last met with those community groups most vitally concerned with plans to move developmentally handicapped individuals out of institutions and into the community. We know that those groups continue to express very real concern about the minister's actions and have urged her not to delay the transfer plans.

In the meantime the union, which had asked for the freeze and whose members' jobs are at stake, has talked

about the failures of past transfers and about the risks of continuing the deinstitutionalization. The union has also made the strength of its influence quite clear. An Ontario Public Service Employees Union newsletter of 21 November states that the minister has assured OPSEU that the union will be consulted before any further moves that affect the jobs of members working with the developmentally handicapped.

I ask the minister which of these rather contradictory positions most accurately reflects her views: deinstitutionalization is too risky to continue; the multi-year plan is being successfully implemented and community integration should proceed; or, perhaps, although I trust not, our priority must be to ensure that union jobs in the institutions must be protected.

Hon Mrs Akande: In my previous life I was an educator and I always hated multiple-choice questions, so this assembly will understand that I am reluctant to respond to them today.

Let me assure the member, as I know she is interested, as I am, that what I am most interested in is that when we move to any facility our clients are well taken care of, that there is no risk involved and that we can be certain that the kinds of unfortunate things that happened to the residents of these facilities under the previous administration will not happen again. That is my prime concern. That is why we are delaying. We are checking our criteria, we are looking at our monitoring of the system and we are making sure that it is sound. As for the unions, I have no idea to what the member refers.

1440

Mrs McLeod: I too dislike multiple-choice questions, and the reason I dislike them is their ambiguity. That is why I very carefully phrased those alternatives to be absolutely non-ambiguous. Our very real concern and the concern of the advocacy groups in the community is that we do not yet understand her very specific reasons for bringing a halt to a program that was well under way and which those groups themselves say was being successfully implemented.

The minister's response today indicates that there may be some concern about the success of past transfers and I want to come back to that because I think many of us were concerned last week when the Conservative critic asked the Premier a question about this deinstitutionalization. The Premier, in responding, seemed to confuse the program, the multi-year plan for moving developmentally handicapped people out of institutions into the community, with a much earlier plan for the deinstitutionalization of psychiatric patients.

It is probably a well-known fact that when psychiatric patients were first moved out of institutions, I think more than a decade ago, there were not adequate community supports in place. But when the Liberal government introduced the multiple-year plan for moving developmentally delayed people out of institutions, the commitment was made that no moves would be made without adequate community supports being put in place.

My very honestly concerned question is, does the minister believe that adequate community supports are or are not in place, and if they are not in place, what will she do to ensure that those supports are put in place so that these moves of people out of institutions and into the community can proceed?

Hon Mrs Akande: I too am very concerned about the adequacy of supports and I have for that reason discussed this with Mr Zwerver and the association. Their understanding of my concern was obvious and they have been extremely supportive in contacting me even subsequent to Saturday to assist me in providing some additional information. I have taken an opportunity to look at all the services that are provided in many communities, to make sure that there are the supports that are necessary in all of the communities. These supports are rather unevenly provided, and it is for that reason that I continue to look at this and continue to act to make sure that those services are provided where they are necessary. I recognize the member's concern; I too share it.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr Stockwell: My question is to the Treasurer. I have here in my left hand—appropriately enough, I guess—An Agenda for People with, by our estimate, promises of some \$14 billion. Equally appropriately enough, I guess, I have in my right hand the economic forecast made by the Treasurer in this House yesterday.

In this economic forecast there is kind of interesting information. One is, "We do not believe that as a government we can spend our way out of this recession." If you go on further to page 7, "The government expects to hold the deficit to within the projected \$2.5 billion," and on page 8, "I remain acutely aware of the difficulty of increasing revenue during a recession."

We have all those economic forecasts, those types of commitments before us from yesterday. We have the NDP Agenda for People, which I will emphasize is a pre-election document. Which document is now the policy for this government? Can the people of this province simply take An Agenda for People and ram it in their blue box and measure the effect of this government's recycling program?

Hon Mr Laughren: Oh, it is so difficult to resist some lines.

Hon Mr Rae: Please do.

Hon Mr Laughren: I am resisting because the Premier insists. I very much appreciate the fact that the critic for the third party appreciates the enormity of the task of mixing the commitments this party has made—not just during the election campaign but in years gone by—and continues to make on some very fundamental principles in which we believe very, very strongly. I think the member for Etobicoke West would appreciate the fact that we have not, as I can recall, retracted any of those principles contained in that Agenda for People. I cannot think of anything in there that I would want to refute—

Mr Nixon: What about the previous one?

Hon Mr Laughren: Or previously.

I would just say to the member for Etobicoke West, however, that he would appreciate—I know because of some of the comments that his leader has made that he would want us to move most prudently at this time of recession, facing a deficit of \$2.5 billion and it is almost certainly going to be more next year, that he would not want us to move with undue haste on the proposals contained in An Agenda for People.

Mr Stockwell: The commitments are before the public. The Treasurer has at least \$7 billion in education commitments to this province for the next five years. In my opinion, I would rather not see a lot of these programs instituted, but the minister's party promised these programs last election. In fact, I think it was the basis for a lot of support that it received across this province. The big issue in the last election was keeping the promises. The previous Premier was chastised by the minister's leader for not keeping all his promises.

The Treasurer has \$14 billion in promises. He now suggests he is going to hold the line on the deficit. He does not really want to increase spending, he does not want taxes to go up and he wants to keep his promises. It does not mix. Something has to give.

He knows he is going to break some promises in here. What the people of the province would like to know is, is it the \$7 billion in education funding? Is it the government's housing policy? Is it the government's environmental policy? What other policies is the government going to put on the back burner and not keep this five-year term?

The government cannot have it both ways. The government cannot be fiscally responsible, stop spending, no debt and claim it is going to fill \$14 billion in promises. Come clean. Which promises is the government not keeping?

Hon Mr Laughren: The member for Etobicoke West is quite right—he is not quite right on his numbers, by the way, but I will not get into that—that we cannot make a commitment to implement the proposals in An Agenda for People this year and next year while at the same time containing the deficit projections for this year at \$2.5 billion, or next year either for that matter. So what I would say to—

Mr Stockwell: So the deficit is?

Hon Mr Laughren: Well, if the member would listen for a moment, what I would say to him is that he cannot listen and talk at the same time. I would just say to the member that I do not believe either he or the people of Ontario expect us to carry out that Agenda for People in this first year or two. He, and others I suspect, will judge us at the end of our mandate, not during the first six months of it.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr Malkowski: This morning at Toronto city hall a broad coalition of women's groups called on the federal government to establish a royal commission to study violence against women. In Canada, one of out eight women suffers from physical abuse from her partner. My question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio

responsible for women's issues. What is her response to this call for action?

Hon Ms Swarbrick: I am pleased to have this opportunity to inform the House that I am strongly supporting this call by the coalition of women's groups for the federal government to establish a commission on violence against women. The groups are calling on this to be a memorial to the 14 women who were killed in Montreal last year and, of course, to the many women killed and maimed across this country each year by violence. I have issued a media release to outline this position and I have asked my staff to provide a copy to each member of this House.

The proposed royal commission would study and document women's experiences of violence, evaluate the responses of our social institutions and make concrete recommendations and timetables for action.

In supporting this call, I would like to explain to the House that I do have a grave concern that this royal commission could deflect the need for the federal government also to take action, as this provincial government has been doing, to deal with this problem. I am calling on the federal government not only to establish this commission but also to ensure that this action is taken meanwhile to prevent violence against women.

1450

Mr Malkowski: What will this government do to educate the public regarding this problem?

Hon Ms Swarbrick: We have just finished going through the fifth year of the wife assault prevention campaign, in which we undertook multimedia ads, brochures and grants to community groups to try to undertake local public education. I, of course, have been going around the province speaking and doing media interviews.

We are also now about to launch the sexual assault initiative which was initiated by the past government; we are about to get that under way. I will provide further full details as we are ready for the next leg of that campaign.

I would also like to inform the House that this government has decided it will allow that sexual assault initiative to mature over the next three years in its own right, as the wife assault initiative is doing, and three years hence plans to roll those together as initiatives into a combined program to eliminate violence against women.

We are now in the process of planning towards what comes after that five-year initiative on wife assault. I would like to invite all members of this House who have ideas to participate with me in the formulation of how we can make serious change to eliminate violence against women in this society.

ROUGE VALLEY

Mr Curling: It was on 26 March 1990 that the Liberal government announced in this House that we have the largest urban park in Canada. At that time, the Minister of Transportation, William Wrye, stated that no new roads would be permitted in the Rouge Valley area south of Steeles Avenue. As recently as 5 November 1990, Pickering council requested that Durham region build a four-lane road across the Rouge River marsh, Metropolitan

Toronto's last class 2 wetland. Also, they recommended the widening of Twyn Rivers Drive as an east-west connection through the area of the Rouge designated as being of natural and scientific interest.

My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. The connection of Lawrence Avenue and Bayly Street would have a serious impact on the Rouge River park. Will the minister confirm that he will uphold the policy of the previous government that no new roads will be built in the Rouge Valley park?

Hon Mr Wildman: As the member will know, an independent advisory committee representing a number of agencies, including the province and the affected municipalities along with citizens' groups, has been set up to guide the planning exercise for the park. Any road construction proposals that could impact on the park will be taken into account by the advisory committee as it considers the planning for the park. I want to emphasize that, in my opinion, any such proposal would be subject to environmental assessment.

Mr Curling: This government was very emphatic in its stand on the Rouge Valley, making all these political promises, saying it can make a commitment. I want a commitment from the minister that no roads will be built in the Rouge Valley. Telling me about environmental assessment now is not a commitment. Could the minister say no new roads will be built in the valley?

Hon Mr Wildman: I want to assure the member that any commitment made by the previous government stays.

Mr Cousens: I hope the government thinks back to the last session, when the member for Mississauga South's bill passed and mine passed that prohibited any roads through the Rouge Valley. There is not going to be a road through the Rouge Valley. We already agreed to that, so just do not even think about it.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr Cousens: This is a question for the Minister of the Environment. During yesterday's debate on waste management, the minister reminded the House that the former Liberal government was afraid to move aggressively on regulations and was afraid to put in place mandatory programs to reduce solid waste. The minister also stated that, contrary to the former government, she is going to put in place plans, strategies and programs to achieve diversion rates of at least 25%. Has the minister tabled these regulations to cabinet? When can we expect to hear what these regulations are here in the House? We need immediate answers on just how the minister is going to accomplish this.

Hon Mrs Grier: I certainly recognize the need to move as quickly as we possibly can with a serious program of waste reduction. My ministry is in the course of preparing regulations. We are also meeting with environmental groups, with the waste reduction advisory committee that was put in place by the previous government, and it is certainly my intention to have a full and comprehensive plan prepared as quickly as I possibly can. I am afraid I cannot give the member a firm date at this point.

Mr Cousens: When the minister talks about a crisis, and she has admitted to that, we are looking for speedy and quick action. We really do not need to remind the minister that the greater Toronto area municipalities are waiting anxiously for some information from the province on exactly how she intends to proceed with her plan. In fact, some councils, notably Metro and the city of Toronto, are putting forth their own suggested bylaws for recycling and reduction efforts.

Will the minister include in her plan Toronto's proposals to force industries to use recycled products and to expand recycling programs to include aluminum foil and plastics? Where does the minister stand on refillable liquor bottles?

Hon Mrs Grier: Let me say that I am really pleased with the proposals that are before Metro council. As I think I indicated in the debate yesterday, this is not a unilateral action; it has to be a partnership with the municipalities that have primary responsibility for waste disposal. I am delighted at the actions that have been taken by Metro and by the region of Halton. I hope that York and the other regions, particularly within the GTA, will respond in the same way.

The effect of the announcement I made last week about the commitment of this government to getting serious about the 3Rs has been a very enthusiastic response from communities across the province, which now know that very shortly they will have in place a system of regulation and a plan for waste reduction at the Ministry of the Environment within which they can fit and to which they can respond. Certainly the elements of that plan the member has mentioned are elements we will be looking at and making a response to.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORP CUTBACKS

Mr Dadamo: In light of the announcement by the CBC to cut back and eliminate broadcast stations throughout Canada and closer to home in my riding of Windsor-Sandwich, I wish to express great displeasure concerning this action today. From my office this afternoon, I learned that CBC Windsor had a \$6.5-million budget and that has now been reduced to \$1.3 million. As well, 82 radio and television people have lost their jobs in Windsor, and in my estimation Windsor is losing excellent local programming.

My question is to the Minister of Culture and Communications. What is the minister's understanding of these drastic cutbacks today?

Hon Mr Marchese: I would like to share with my colleague and the other members of this House my feelings and my understanding of this matter. I think the cuts to the CBC are a national disaster. This action represents almost the strangulation of the CBC. It will mean several things. It means joblessness, and at this time in this recession this is not good news. It will jeopardize access to Canadian programming: 10 of the 17 local programs are being closed down, and that is a serious problem for Canada. Third, I think it is an attack on our cultural identity and sovereignty. What this does, to use the example of

Windsor, is literally give away our airwaves to the Americans. They only have one television program in Windsor, and what it does is leave the American television programming to go into Windsor, and that is all they will get. At a time when Mulroney speaks of national unity, this does nothing to bring unity in Canada, but it does a great deal to aggravate disunity.

1500

Mr Dadamo: Given this outrageous action that chips away at our cultural unity, what does the minister plan to do about this ripping apart of our cultural sovereignty?

Hon Mr Marchese: Several things—

Mr Scott: Lead a revolt. Now it comes. Come on, Rosario, lead it.

Hon Mr Marchese: I think the member for St George-St David will lead us.

I will be expressing my indignation to these cuts. I will urge the federal government, the minister and the Prime Minister, to restore funding to the CBC, not only to restore but to enhance the funding it needs. I will work, as the member for Mississauga West suggested, with my federal counterparts to achieve that end.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr McGuinty: My question is for the Minister of Energy. It relates to gasoline prices and follows on her failure to protect the consumers of this province from what her leader has in the past called price gouging.

The NDP in the past has advocated a number of actions to ensure equitable gasoline prices across the province. In particular, they have promised to continually review gas prices, to hold public hearings to determine fair prices, to set equal wholesale and retail prices across the province, and to permit increases in price only when they have been justified at public hearings. We are now looking for the conversion from rhetoric to reality. Will the minister tell this House when and how she will equalize gas prices across Ontario?

Hon Mrs Carter: I believe I answered this question yesterday, but I will answer it again anyway. We are monitoring gas prices carefully in this province. Prices have increased to some degree, as everybody knows, but not as much as crude oil prices. We do have emergency plans in place so that if supply or prices went beyond what we feel is reasonable we would take appropriate action.

Mr Ramsay: I would like to further this questioning to the minister. This is the same answer as yesterday. We are not talking about monitoring. As the minister is aware, many of her northern colleagues during the recent election made a commitment that this government, coming into power, would equalize gas prices around the province. Specifically, to give you an example, the Minister of Northern Development said in her election material she was committed to create a Nova Scotia-style regulatory commission so we could equalize prices right across the province.

I would like to ask the minister, when we have prices as we had yesterday—and I do not know how the member for Cochrane North would justify this with his constituents

at home—unleaded super gasoline yesterday in Hearst sold for 77 cents a litre, about 13 cents a litre more than that being sold in Windsor. We would like to know from the minister: When is she going to set up this commission and what will be its regulatory powers?

Hon Mrs Carter: There are special factors at work in the north as regards gasoline prices, and this is not a new thing. For one thing, the bulk of gasoline being sold is less so that it is more costly to deliver it. It is farther away from the United States and, as everybody knows, people have been in the habit of crossing the border when they were near enough to do so because prices there were less.

There also are local problems in that in some areas, it has been brought to my attention, the prices are considerably higher than they are in other towns just a few miles away. We can only attribute that to local suppliers who are in fact charging more than they should. We do have under consideration the possibility of setting up alternative suppliers there, maybe on a co-operative basis, so that if that is the reason for the higher prices, then that would solve the problem over time.

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr Eves: I have a question for the Minister of Northern Development. Just a few months ago, on 19 August 1990, to be exact, the Premier made a commitment to the people of northern Ontario, and I quote directly from *An Agenda for People*:

“We propose a northern fund of \$400 million over two years—returning money that’s made in the north to the north—to promote economic development, job protection and job creation and improved services throughout the north. The fund would be supported at the rate of \$200 million a year.”

He went on to say in the *Agenda*:

“New Democrats would make a further \$100 million a year available for the four-laning of the Trans-Canada Highway through northern Ontario.”

The funding announced yesterday by the Treasurer, some \$20 million for the first six months of this government at least, falls far short of the \$300-million-a-year commitment made by the Premier last 19 August. Where is the commitment to northern Ontario?

Hon Miss Martel: I point out to the member that in fact the announcement made by the Treasurer yesterday with respect to the \$700 million and some of the announcements that will be made at the end of this week with respect to the portion going to northern Ontario are only the first stage of the funding that is going to northern Ontario. The projects we will announce are short-term winter work projects; the rest of the package with respect to northern Ontario, the portion we will get out of the \$700 million, will be announced some time in mid-January, and I look forward to making those announcements.

With respect to the broader question of where the \$200 million is over two years, I would remind the member of two things. We are in a recession, and we do have a debt. It was his party and his leader, who is a northerner as well, who got up in the House on Thursday and said we should adopt a policy of restraint. I find it very strange that he can

have the two sides and come here and ask me where this money is.

I say very clearly to the members of this House that we have a four-and-a-half-year mandate, we have a very good Agenda for People, which is a vision for this party for the future, and we intend to implement that agenda over a four-and-a-half-year mandate.

Mr Eves: It was the Treasurer who stood in this House and said that everybody knew in April that this province was in a recession. That was many months before her Premier bought the votes in northern Ontario on 19 August, if the minister wants some rhetoric.

Now another quote from the Premier's Agenda: "Men and women across Ontario"—

The Speaker: Whoa, whoa. It is amazing how on such a cold day outside, the temperature can rise so quickly indoors. The member for Parry Sound may wish to consider the language used in describing how votes were obtained as he rephrases his question.

Hon Mr Pouliot: This isn't a poolroom.

Mr Eves: I would certainly like to withdraw the remark about buying votes. To quote one of the honourable members opposite, perhaps it was "poolroom" behaviour during the election campaign by the Premier of the province.

Another quote from An Agenda for People: "Men and women across Ontario have told me that they don't want promises that can't be kept."

For the minister to stand here in the House today and say they have four or five years to fulfil their commitment is simply not what An Agenda for People says. I refer her to pages 10 and 11 of her own document, which says she will spend this money during fiscal year 1990-91. The money, according to her Premier's commitment this August, will be spent, all \$300 million of it, in northern Ontario by 31 March 1991. That is what he said. He said: "Don't tell untruths in campaigns to people, giving promises you don't intend to keep." Is she going to keep the promise or not, yes or no?

1510

Hon Miss Martel: I remind the member that in April of this year, when we knew that there was a recession, we certainly did not know that there would be a \$2.5-billion deficit in this province. I suggest to the member that regardless of which government was in power in this place, any government would have to deal with that.

Now, I have said clearly to him and my leader has said clearly to this House that we intend to move forward with the promises made in An Agenda for People. I also know that the people who I talk to around the north are very conscious of the fact that not only do we have a deficit but also we are in a recession, and they believe, as I believe, that over the course of our mandate we will keep those promises.

I remind the member again that I find it very strange that he can get up in this House and ask this question, when his leader called on this government for a policy of restraint. He cannot have it both ways.

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr Drainville: As we are no doubt aware, there is presently great difficulty in the tourism industry, and I would like to address the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. As he has seen in the last week or two, there have been recent newspaper articles indicating that the industry is in decline. That is certainly an underestimation. I must say that this decline is very worrisome to the people of Victoria-Haliburton and we are wondering what the minister is going to do, what he is planning to do to alleviate the decline faced by the tourism industry in Ontario.

Hon Mr North: I want to thank the member for Victoria-Haliburton for the very good question. I appreciate it and I understand the concerns that he raises.

Our ministry is presently working on three major ways to better the tourism industry. We are working on better promotion, better facilities and infrastructure and better service to the communities. We are also presently launching an extensive marketing campaign to promote the province and to make sure that our ads portray Ontario in an exciting and very creative way. I have had meetings with the industry on a number of occasions already and we are enjoying a very good working relationship.

Mr Villeneuve: Don't be too hard on him.

Mr Drainville: I will try not to. It seems that one of the problems we have in the tourism industry is keeping our competitive edge, and we have not been able to do that in the last number of years. We have seen that in terms of the mismanagement of the tourism industry under the last government. Right now what we need are some initiatives on the part of our government. We know also that the goods and services tax is going to have an impact, that there are federal policies that are impinging upon our ability to make the industry grow, so I would ask the Minister of Tourism and Recreation if he could possibly give an indication of how we are going to be able to maintain our competitive edge in this industry.

Hon Mr North: Unfortunately, there is not a lot I can do about the federal government. What we have done is, we have talked to the people in the industry and we have asked them very clearly to see if they can give us some direction as to what they think are the tax measures that would help. Just yesterday, as a matter of fact, I spoke at Tourism Ontario and I discussed some different ways and means by which we could implement a joint working group between the industry and ourselves, the ministry. I think that once the necessary research is done we will have a very good system in place and we will have a very good presentation that we can bring forth to the Fair Tax Commission.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE RADIO SERVICES

Mr Grandmaitre: I will try to be very short. My question is addressed to the Minister of Culture and Communications. I have listened very carefully to the question asked by a member of his own party, the member for Windsor-Sandwich, where 500,000 southern Ontarians will be affected by the budget cuts, but I want him to remember that this government provided \$5 million

on 1 August to TVO's la Chaîne française to provide French radio services right across this province. As he knows, a good number of francophones are located in the Windsor area.

I am much more concerned about my own people, my own community, which will be cut off completely from those services. Is the minister willing to spend some of those dollars from the \$5 million that he has just received to provide French services? Is he willing to use some of these dollars to provide all francophones with radio services right across Ontario?

Hon Mr Marchese: I have two responses. One, I would like to separate the issues in terms of what I was speaking to with regard to the CBC cuts; that is, as a national issue, that will affect all of the French-speaking communities and everybody throughout the country. I think that people pay taxes to be able to get national services for everybody throughout the country.

In terms of what we are doing, we give plenty of money to TVO—to the tune of \$60 million—and we are providing the services that I think we need to provide in Ontario so that all French-speaking Canadians have access to that service. I will make sure, as I am doing, that they continue to get that service, but I want to make sure that I will do my best not to take away from what the federal government needs to do nationally.

CITY OF VANIER ACT

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received a report from the Ontario Municipal Board with respect to Bill Pr30, An Act respecting the City of Vanier.

Bill and report ordered for standing committee on regulations and private bills.

PETITIONS

AIR AND WATER QUALITY

Mr Carr: I am pleased to table a petition to the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, signed by approximately 1,200 residents of Oakville and area, objecting to the Petro-Canada refinery, Bronte plant, continuing to pollute the air and water. The odour and effluent from the refinery process is, in their belief, causing health problems and is a nuisance to the property, therefore reducing the property value.

FANSHAWE PIONEER VILLAGE

Mrs Mathysen: I have a petition signed by 21 members of the Catholic Women's League of Mary Immaculate Parish, London, asking that every effort be made to secure permanent funding for Fanshawe Pioneer Village and that the village be kept open until at least December 1991 while funding is sought. I have signed my name to this petition.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Mr Sutherland from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr17, An Act to revive The Interlock People Ltd.

Bill Pr18, An Act to revive Conyork Construction & Engineering Ltd.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting The Oratory of Saint Philip Neri—Toronto.

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the Town of Richmond Hill.

Your committee further recommends that the fees, and the actual cost of printing at all stages and in the annual statutes, be remitted on Bill Pr19, An Act respecting The Oratory of Saint Philip Neri—Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

1520

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT (PREGNANCY AND PARENTAL LEAVE), 1990

Mr Mackenzie moved first reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act with respect to Pregnancy and Parental Leave.

Motion agreed to.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: These changes to the Employment Standards Act are being made to protect the jobs of workers who take extended leaves to look after their newborn or newly adopted children. The changes will also protect Ontario workers who wish to claim the new unemployment insurance benefits now available to new parents.

MANITOULIN, BARRIE AND COCKBURN ISLANDS ACT, 1990

Mr Wildman moved first reading of Bill 15, An Act respecting Land on Manitoulin Island, Barrie Island and Cockburn Island.

Motion agreed to.

Hon Mr Wildman: This is a historic piece of legislation for Ontario. As I said earlier today, I have had the honour of signing the first land claim ever resolved by the government of Ontario. The claim concerned Manitoulin Island and the land surrendered by the first nations in 1862. The land was intended to be sold by the crown for the benefit of the native people. However, the first nations were never paid for 80,000 acres of land they gave up. Today, 128 years later, the first nations received payment for it.

The legislation will enable the government to implement the agreement by transferring land to the first

nations. The total land claim settlement is worth some \$9 million. I am pleased with the agreement and the legislation we are introducing today. The purpose of the bill is to fulfil our commitments under the agreement.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Cooke moved first reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend the Municipal Elections Act and certain other Acts related to Municipal Elections.

Motion agreed to.

CHILD AND FAMILY SUPPORT STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

LOI DE 1990 MODIFIANT LES LOIS RELATIVES
AUX OBLIGATIONS ALIMENTAIRES

Mr Hampton moved first reading of Bill 17, An Act to amend the law related to the enforcement of support and custody orders.

M. Hampton propose la première lecture du projet de loi 17, Loi portant modification des lois relatives à l'exécution d'ordonnances alimentaires et de garde d'enfants.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Hon Mr Hampton: The principal purpose of the amendments to the Support and Custody Orders Enforcement Act, 1985, is to provide for the automatic support payments from the income of people required to pay support and to provide for the payment to the director of the child and family support office of the amount deducted. This will be done through a new court order which is created by the bill. We believe that this bill will be very important in the future in terms of dealing with child poverty.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Ms Wark-Martyn moved second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: This bill implements the changes required to eliminate the stacking of retail sales tax on the goods and services tax. It also implements the changes announced by the former Treasurer in his budget of 24 April 1990. These changes are designed to reduce the confusion the federal goods and services tax will bring.

To begin with, as I promised a few weeks ago, this bill contains an amendment to the provincial sales tax base that redefines the definition of fair value. It ensures that Ontario consumers will not pay provincial sales tax on top of the federal GST, if the GST is implemented.

The introduction of the GST will put a lot of pressure on retailers and we recognize the additional costs that will result for some. To offset some of this burden, the compensation to vendors for collecting retail sales tax will increase from 4% to 5%, and the maximum compensation per year will increase to \$1,100 for the current fiscal year and to \$1,500 for all subsequent years.

Amendments in sections 2, 7, 9, 10 and 14 are for administrative purposes and bring retail sales tax into line with similar GST measures. They increase the time limits on audits and refunds to four years from three years and for keeping records from six years to seven.

Visitors to our province will benefit from changes to the tourist rebate program on goods removed from Ontario and on transient accommodation to parallel the limits in the federal legislation.

To assist manufacturers, the definition of "production machinery" currently tied to part of the Excise Tax Act, which will be repealed with the GST, will now be prescribed by regulation.

The tire tax, when it was first passed, placed harsh conditions on the short-term car rental industry. This bill will allow us to establish a formula to ensure fairness among renters while ensuring that all taxes are paid.

With the passage of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, certain confidentiality provisions will be updated and brought in line with other ministry statutes.

Again, paralleling GST, directors of corporations will be made personally liable for retail sales tax collected by their companies in specific circumstances. Provided that a director exercises due diligence, he or she will not incur personal liability for tax collected but not remitted.

The GST rules propose charging interest on a compound basis. Similarly, the bill proposes changing retail sales tax interest to the compound basis. Interest paid on overpayments of tax will also be compounded at the same rate as on taxes due.

Finally, tax practitioners have indicated that the movement of assets is difficult when a small business is expanding and bringing in additional partners. This bill will simplify the requirements needed to transfer business assets.

The Speaker: Questions or comments?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am pleased to rise today in the debate on second reading of Bill 1, the Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1990.

The Speaker: Order. The first item is our questions or comments to the member who has spoken, before we enter into debate. I thought the member wished to ask questions or to make comments.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am sorry. I would like to respond to the minister's statement.

1530

The Speaker: Are there questions or comments? Okay, further debate.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Once again, Mr Speaker, I thank you.

The Minister of Revenue's press release, dated 20 November, quotes her as saying "Our first piece of legislation fulfils our commitment to reverse the previous government's decision when it increased provincial revenues by stacking RST on GST." What the minister did not say is that there is a great deal more to this bill than simply that, and it is the implications of those additional aspects of Bill 1 that I wish to focus upon today.

Bill 1 goes to great lengths to harmonize Ontario's tax laws with the proposed federal goods and services tax. I repeat, harmonize and accommodate the GST. This NDP government has now its opportunity to divorce itself completely from the GST, and yet in this opportunity we are provided with a small diversion at best—no divorce, no real cutting loose.

None of us needs to be reminded of what the New Democratic Party's policy was when it was to have come into implementation: "The GST is the wrong tax on the wrong people at the wrong time." "Ontario should cut itself loose from the Mulroney tax program." "Fighting the GST is a major priority of this government." "We reject an amalgamated sales tax." "We're committed to making taxes fairer by saying from the beginning that we will have nothing to do with the Mulroney tax." And my personal favourite: "Ontario should lead a tax revolt—a revolt against the Mulroney GST."

In fact, as late as Tuesday of this week, according to a Southam News report, the Premier of this province met with the leader of the federal New Democratic Party and other NDP leaders from across Canada to discuss a five-point plan to fix the Canadian economy. One of the five points was to scrap the GST.

But from the very beginning, this government has introduced, as its very first piece of legislation—may I repeat, its very first opportunity to present legislation—in this House and to the province of Ontario, a bill which is almost in complete harmony with the GST. A promise to the people of Ontario, "Fighting the GST is a major priority of this government," has been broken. Leading a tax revolt has been left quietly in the dust.

May I now proceed through the various sections of this legislation as I demonstrate a real reversal of direction within this present government? Indeed, it is a 95% about-turn, a 95% about-face in a revolt that was to have happened. I quote from the explanatory notes appended to the legislation itself which, in the minister's own words, brings Ontario RST into line with similar GST measures.

Section 2: "The amendments in this section...are made...to parallel similar provisions in the proposed goods and services tax legislation." Parallel is the key word.

Section 3: "This amendment...authorizes the minister to pay a rebate of tax paid on tangible personal property purchased in Ontario and taken outside the province for permanent use outside Ontario, and a rebate of tax paid on transient accommodation by a person not resident in Ontario."

"Subsection 15(2)...will...enable the minister to make regulations providing for both types of rebates. The provision of these tourist rebates by regulation will provide the minister with flexibility in prescribing terms and conditions of rebates similar to those provided for rebates to be made under the proposed goods and services tax legislation."

Section 11: "This re-enactment of section 32 of the act provides for the compounding of interest daily or as otherwise prescribed by the minister on all amounts owing under the act. This amendment will parallel a similar

provision in the proposed goods and services tax legislation."

Section 13: "This amendment provides for the joint and several liability of directors of a corporation for amounts owing and unpaid by the corporation under the act. The amendment is parallel to the proposed goods and services tax legislation." How many times have I read the word "parallel"?

"The amendments in the sections of the bill listed in subsection 16(2) relate to the proposed goods and services tax. The intent is that these sections will not come into force until the goods and services tax becomes law in Canada, but upon that happening the listed sections will be effective as of the first day of January 1991."

For a government that said it would have nothing to do with the GST, "cut loose," "fighting," "revolt" have become the much softer words of "parallel," "similar," "accommodate." How interesting. In Bill 1, this NDP government is going to considerable lengths to harmonize its sales tax policy, the sales tax policy of the province of Ontario, with the new GST and plans to continue to do so into the future by extending through ministerial powers its ability to enact much new tax policy by regulation rather than legislation.

Bill 1 proposes to permit the Minister of Revenue to make new tax policy and in effect enact new tax law by regulation without ever bringing proposed new taxes to this Legislature for debate.

This is done no doubt in anticipation of new policies that will stem from the GST, new taxes without listening, without consulting, without debating, taxation by regulation to harmonize with the hated GST. Is this in keeping with the very basic democratic tradition of no taxation without representation? Is it in step with the proposed tax commission promised in the NDP government's speech from the throne?

How interesting for a government, an open government, a government of consultation, "a government that will listen to the people," "a government that will work with all partners in the economy on the design and implementation of Ontario's tax system."

Take one industry as an example: our tourism operators—the effect of this decision, of tax policy by regulation on their industry, an industry indeed which has done its own impact study. Rebates for this industry are now going to be placed into regulation. In the minister's words today, these measures are to parallel the limits in the GST federal legislation. These regulations, rather than legislation, result in more and more instability, instability in an industry which is often the first to feel the effects of recession, an industry which often involves family operations and small business people. Indeed, it hits hard at this large but vulnerable industry that is situated in every region of this province.

I also have concerns relating to business inputs and the results that Bill 1 has in this province for manufacturers.

Section 5 of Bill 1 will repeal the aspects of the Retail Sales Tax Act that had allowed for exemption from provincial sales tax for production equipment and machinery. This section, which allows the minister to make exemp-

tions for production equipment and machinery, again by regulation, will mean that there is a time lag between the time the minister can bring in new exemptions and the implementation date of the GST. This time lag will cause particular damage to the competitive position of Ontario manufacturing vis-à-vis the province of Quebec.

Many companies in eastern Ontario, the part of the province that I represent, do business or indeed compete with businesses based in Quebec. What this means in essence is that the Quebec government has guaranteed its manufacturing sector an estimated 3% competitive advantage over their Ontario counterparts, who will no longer have the sales tax exemptions. This when we are in a recession.

1540

Bill 1 accommodates—and I want to repeat the word “accommodates”—the GST in the matter of sales tax rebates for tourists as well as endorses the elimination of exemptions for certain manufactured goods, harmonizes interest charged on tax owed to the government, and extends liability, again paralleling the GST—the minister’s own words this afternoon for tax owed to corporate directors. Yet the Minister of Revenue brushes all of this aside. She does not even breathe a mention in her press release of one section of this bill beyond its first clause. She does not even whisper that Bill 1 is more than friendly to the GST. In fact, Bill 1 has made a promise of marriage to the GST.

On numerous other sections of Bill 1 that are “horrendously complex,” to use the minister’s own words as she speaks about the GST, difficult, and which indeed need explanation, the minister is almost silent. Although the minister says she does not want to add to confusion, this she has certainly done for both consumers and small businesses in this province; and to speak to this point more directly, the promised communication strategy is almost non-existent. How unfair, how unfortunate for the consumers and small businesses in this province.

May I ask again, where does Bill 1 cut loose or divorce itself from the Mulroney tax? Accommodate, amalgamate, harmonize, accept describe Bill 1 better in its relationship to the GST.

Bill 1 is complex and confusing. If you and I examine it closely, Mr Speaker, we, the people of Ontario, you and I, must spend \$100 to save 56 cents, while at the same time being subjected to taxation by regulation, increased taxation without representation, the formation of tax policy without debate.

Is this what the people of Ontario really expected from those who label themselves the leaders of a tax revolt? Bill 1 is a small step in a time of need, a weak initiative in difficult times, a deficient economic incentive in a tough year—“difficult times,” “tough year”—this government’s own words.

This minister had many options to stimulate the economy in tough times by tax reform, to put more money into the hands of the Ontario consumer, you and I, Mr Speaker, but this government made the decision in its very first bill to take one small step, one small initiative in an area that is of great importance to you and I.

How much braver real reform would have been, tax reform that could have been creative, revenue policy that would have really fought the impact of the recession, that would have really put a dent in the deficit. But again we have a moratorium, a wait-and-see position. How unfortunate; a prime opportunity missed.

How much braver it would have been for the minister to announce a reduction of 1% in Ontario’s retail sales tax. This step would have truly bolstered Ontario’s economy at a time when such stimulus is desperately needed. A reduction in the sales tax rate could boost Ontario’s economic growth. You know that, Mr Speaker, and so do I. It could lower inflation. The province’s unemployment rate could be reduced and it could create up to 15,000 jobs in the Ontario economy at this time of need. On top of all of this, it would have left \$1.1 billion instead of \$500 million in the pockets of the people of Ontario.

This move would have been truly brave, but we hear over and over again from this Premier and other members of cabinet, day after day, “We are doing our best, our very best.” I, for one, do not think so. It seems that the only tax reform that this minister can muster is fed-bashing.

I close with a series of questions to the Minister of Revenue. As I asked the minister earlier today, when will she begin to lead her promised national tax revolt? This was not to be a so-called revolt, as she answered earlier to me today; this was to be a real revolt. She does have transportation to Ottawa as a member of this Legislature. Perhaps she would like to take that trip.

Does Bill 1 really cut loose the Ontario tax system from the Mulroney tax? Is this tax really what the people of Ontario think it is? I do not think so. Is this government really fighting this tax down to the last wire in these 27 days that remain, this tax that no one wants? I see very, very little sign of fight. I do see about-face and about-turn.

Is Bill 1 truly this government’s very best effort at having nothing to do with the GST? I hope not. Is the minister recommending that the taxpayers of Ontario not pay the GST? She certainly did not answer my question when I asked it earlier.

To this date, we in this House have had no real answers to the questions I have just posed. Bill 1 is much, much less than this government could have done, much less than it should have done. Tax reform, Bill 1 is not. Incentive to economic growth, Bill 1 is not. Creative reform, Bill 1 is not. Acceptance of the GST without a murmur, without a whisper, without a sigh or even a muffled roll of revolt, is what Bill 1 really is. The tax revolt promised to the people of Ontario, like many of this government’s promises, is in the mortuary, the morgue.

Mr Hope: As we heard that elegant speech about the bill itself, when it finally got down to parallel versus horizontal, we find out where the Liberal government would be is horizontal on the GST.

I think a lot of people are looking forward to seeing what is coming out of this bill. I know a number of us have been on the streets fighting the GST. We do not need to lobby it from an area of the Queen’s Park offices. Most of us are in the communities out there on the streets protesting, not offering a lot of lipservice. That is one of the main

things we must get across. It is a federal jurisdiction but it does not stop us provincial members being out there in our communities airing our concerns. This is only one step that this provincial government is doing to make sure that we run parallel, not horizontal, on the GST itself.

Mrs Sullivan: I want to comment on the remarks from the member for Ottawa-Rideau. As usual with the remarks she presents to the House, her words were thoughtful and analytical. She had clearly done her homework and examined the bill in a way that the previous speaker had not.

I was very interested, first of all, in her comments relating to the failure of the crusade, the vaunted crusade, against the GST which the government had promised and to have seen that this has in fact turned into a going along with the GST.

1550

There was another matter the member raised that I think is very important and I hope the minister will speak to it as we proceed through the debate.

Section 3 of the bill, as the member pointed out, will enable the minister to change tax laws without reference to the Legislature. There will be a particular impact as a result of that change, as the member has pointed out, on the tourist industry and on our retail trade, particularly in relation to our tourist visitors and for other exports.

I wonder if, as the member has indicated, the minister will guarantee that she will respond relating to any consultative arrangements she has set up with representatives of the tourism industry, the hospitality industry and the retail trade relating to the kinds of impact those changes by regulation may have on their operations. I want to thank the member for Ottawa-Rideau for raising those points.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: My entire remarks this afternoon were really an attempt, as was my question earlier, to bring to the floor of this House the desire I have to know the degree of commitment that this government and this minister has to very serious promises made to take a leadership role in something everyone in this province understands very well: the GST. There is nothing that has had more media coverage and more conversation over kitchen tables and in backyards this summer than that particular tax.

In examining every document that has been presented to me by this minister and in listening to every word she has said in the House, I have been unable to determine a sense of commitment to the revolt that was promised, a divorcing of this government's position from a fundamental tax bill in this province. I have heard and observed, and every word I read in the legislation is congruent, other than no tax on the tax which is a situation and a part of the bill that really separates itself out; it has to do with collection. As I said, \$100 has to be spent to save 56 cents.

I am asking this government not to be an observer of the economy of this country or this province; I am asking them to do something in a time of need. I am asking this government to give leadership and direction on tax reform, something that is very near and dear to each of us.

Mr Stockwell: Before I get involved in the actual debating of the motion or piece of legislation, we should first discuss the revolt against the GST and the federal government by this particular government. It reminds me—much the same—of the Liberal government's promise of the free trade revolt that was going to take place.

From sitting in municipal government at Metropolitan Toronto, I also recall very clearly many, many debates that took place about the Metropolitan Toronto level of government having grave concerns with whatever government was there, be it Conservative or Liberal, and how there was going to be a major offensive on the pink palace down the street.

It never really materialized because the facts of life are simply this: The federal government has the power and jurisdiction to do certain things, the provincial government has those powers on a smaller basis, and the municipal governments have the same powers to plow your roads and collect your garbage and so on and so on.

Anybody who promises you open revolt and non-compliance and so on with respect to certain pieces of legislation by a more senior level of government is simply blowing smoke. It just is not going to happen. They are strong words and there are interesting slogans that come out of them, open revolt and so on, but the fact of the matter is that the debate is not whether the NDP government has in fact had this open revolt; the NDP government has no power to have an open revolt. For the NDP government, it matters not what it thinks of the GST and it matters not what its rank and file think of the GST. There is not one thing they can do about it. It is very clear today that there is not one thing they can do about it, because they are doing what they are doing. They are instituting this piece of legislation before us.

It makes me hark back to those days at Metropolitan Toronto when we would puff up our chests with all the bravado and tell the members of Metro council how we were going to go down to Queen's Park and beat up a Premier.

To continue on, our party has been very consistent with respect to the GST and our opposition to it. We spoke during the campaign—even before the campaign if members would check the record—in opposition to the GST. Our leader was campaigning for the leadership of our party and his position was equally clear. It was opposed—

Mr Mahoney: Honest Mike.

Mr Stockwell: Honest Mike; that is right. He was opposed to the GST and he said so with some concern from the Conservatives in Ottawa, no doubt about it, but he stood his ground and said, "I am opposed." He also said during the campaign that he would not tax on tax. I think that is a position he has taken on which we have been very firm. I fundamentally do not agree with tax on tax. Now apparently neither does this government. If that is the case, then I think they had better review some of the pieces of legislation that were passed and are in fact in place today.

The tire tax is a perfect example of tax on tax. The government today, with a simple amendment by the

minister, could be consistent with respect to its policy on tax on tax. They could do away with that double-dipping of the taxpayers when it comes to the tire tax. What it basically means is that they are generating revenue from tax on a tax.

Mr Mahoney: Explain double-dipping.

Mr Stockwell: For the member for Mississauga West, who I think is fully cognizant of what that means, it means—his government was professional at it.

Mr Mahoney: I always thought it was at Dairy Queen. What is it?

Mr Stockwell: They do it at the Dairy Queen too. What it means basically is taxing tax, and in fact those members have an historic platform for just that. So our position is clear. Our support today is equally clear. We will endorse this piece of work from the Minister of Revenue. We think there are flaws and there are concerns, but overall we think that it is something the taxpayers in the province of Ontario will enjoy. Clearly, a \$500-million benefit to the taxpayers is nothing to be sneezed at and I think that it is something they will look forward to and certainly appreciate.

Now I would ask that the minister also look into this tax on tax for the tire tax and, hopefully, she can do something about that, just so that she may become consistent. I would not want her to be inconsistent, considering the implementation of An Agenda for People and the government's consistent backpedalling on that one.

The concerns that I have stem also from further taxes that I think the minister could look at. Her party was equally opposed—this was probably the most high-profile issue that was debated on the campaign trail when it came to taxes, but there were other taxes that her party was opposed to as well.

I speak of the commercial concentration tax, one of the most regressive taxes ever implemented. It is a tax that is just killing municipalities with respect to paying a tax that is really unfair. It is really an unfair tax directed basically at the greater Toronto area. It is nothing more than a discriminatory tax against Toronto and the area.

I think it would be important for the Minister of Revenue if she could also gain some consistency, and not just with the high-profile goods and services tax. She would gain some credibility with being consistent, not just with the high-profile GST but also by doing away with the commercial concentration tax. I know full well that is a tax that every mayor, every council, every school board, every transit system in GTA opposes. It is not fair. It is inequitable and in my opinion it should be struck down. If the minister could do that, I think she would have a great sigh of relief from all parties involved at the municipal level.

1600

Just to give an example, her party is committed to public transportation and the effective movement of people within the GTA, which we are as well, and it certainly is a laudable platform, but it goes contrary to and flies in the face of that commercial concentration tax by hiking parking lot hourly rates at all subway stops, GO stations etc. Those are a couple of the issues that I think would help me

in accepting that they truly believe in this opposition to tax on tax and that they truly believe in a consistent, equitable tax system for the province of Ontario.

They do not have to go through an 18-month process to figure out that these couple of taxes are unfair and inequitable. They know that right now. If they could just do away with those, I am sure a lot of people in the GTA would be extremely happy.

The one major concern I have with this piece of legislation is the petulant attitude that the government has taken with respect to separate collections. I think it is obviously their attempt to justify this open revolt process that they have suggested they will undertake. It is not an open revolt; it is petulance. It is simply the case that they are causing the taxpayers tremendous sums of money for no real, worthy purpose. There is absolutely nothing to be gained by the position of separate collections, nothing at all.

To bring it back to a municipal level again, since some of the members opposite come from the municipal field, it would be much the same as the local council saying to the regional council or to the school boards, "We are not going to collect your taxes." That is insane. Then you would have duplication of tax collection. In certain cases you would have three levels of government going out to collect taxes off the same people. Now in all honesty, that is insane. It is insane from the point of staffing it. It is insane from the point of funding it.

If they think for a moment that this ruse, this red herring that they are offering is going to be taken as some kind of revolt against the goods and services tax, I think they are very sadly mistaken. The time will come in the not-too-distant future when they as a government will figure that this has served its purpose, and it will in fact be adopted through the process, through a small piece of legislation. It will be changed to a more efficient process of collecting the tax money.

I do not believe that the constituents of this country and this province really would like to see a provincial government exacerbate the problem of collection, or exacerbate the problem of the GST with its tax implications by in fact piling more taxes on top of it through separate collections. That is exactly what they are doing. As I said, it is petulant, poorly planned and ill conceived. If this is their attempt to justify their open revolt, it is laughable.

I know full well some of their members must agree because I know their positions from a municipal level, their positions with respect to duplication of the tax bills, etc. The member for Downsview, I am certain, understands the point I am trying to make.

The army of bureaucrats it is going to take to collect this, believe it or not, is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 3,800 person-years. What is hard to believe about that is that it is going to take more money, \$365 million, that this government is going to spend more, \$365 million to enslave the taxpayers, than it spent liberating Kuwait. It seems to me they are liberating one country and enslaving another. It is going to cost them more to collect taxes than to liberate a country, which I guess is a sign of the times.

We all say there is a lot of bureaucracy. I think it is pretty clear that, man, are they overstaffed.

The savings are none. There are no real savings with respect to this piece of legislation. From a government point of view, there are only costs. The one selling point that we totally agree with is the \$500 million that the taxpayers will save, and we will support this piece of legislation.

If there were some way we could split a money bill, we probably would and not endorse the separate collection. It is not a revolt. It is a petulant act.

In conclusion, our party is in favour. We support this. It was a good idea when we thought it up. It must be a good idea when they stole it. So we will endorse this piece of legislation.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments.

Mr Mammoliti: I look across and I see empty seats. The member for Etobicoke West certainly likes to talk; there is no question about it. That brings me to a comment that he made about blowing smoke. Look who is blowing smoke. I have been in this chamber for a few weeks now and I have heard the member for Etobicoke West talk. I leave once in a while. I come back and the member for Etobicoke West is still talking. There is no difference whether there are people in those seats or whether there are not. The member for Etobicoke West seems to be doing all the talking. So let's talk about blowing smoke and look at who is blowing the smoke.

I ask the member for Etobicoke West again and I plead with him—he wants something to be done about the GST—to go to his federal leader. I plead with him, we plead with him, to go to his federal leader, talk to him and get all these people who seem to be away from their seats to talk to him and plead with him to stop this from being implemented. This is important. I will say it again. Stop blowing the smoke and stop accusing us of blowing the smoke.

Mr Stockwell: That was an interesting comment. I do not know what the point was. Maybe somebody will, somewhere. What is very clear is that he must have been out of the room because he was not listening. What I said with respect to blowing smoke was: "You're wasting your time. You're moving the GST through." In fact, it is a tax that is going to happen 1 January. The minister has agreed that it is going to take place 1 January.

I thought I was being very kind with respect to the policy, to his party's position on an open revolt. Where is their open revolt? Is the GST going to go through on 1 January? Apparently so. Their open revolt is this petulant attitude that they are not going to collect the tax, thereby costing the taxpayers more money.

The comments, I think, are unfair and unreasonable, considering the fact that this party, through the campaign and before the campaign, did not support the GST. We were firmly opposed. We did not support a tax on a tax. Our position was clear. If the federal government is listening to us, it would be hearing exactly the same thing yesterday that I said today, and that we will be saying tomorrow. If the federal party listens to the member's

party, it hears something different yesterday, something different today and probably something very different tomorrow.

Mr Drainville: I was going to speak about some of the sections of the bill that have not been spoken about at this time, but it seems to me that as we begin the debate we need to talk about the philosophy behind taxation, because surely, as we look across the House and hear the comments about the GST and how these parties have been the saviours, if you will, of the people of this province in terms of taxation—we heard the inaccuracies given to us by the other party.

The member for Nipissing, when he was running for the leadership of the Conservative Party, made it very clear that he thought the GST was a great thing. I will be glad to give chapter and verse in terms of Globe and Mail reports, and Star reports also, to the honourable member to show him what the member for Nipissing said as he was running for the leadership.

We hear also from the official opposition. We hear many things about how they are going to support the people of this province now, when they themselves thought the GST was a great thing. The member for Brant-Haldimand himself, in many public utterances, gave his view of how the GST was a good tax, a tax that should be brought into this province, a tax that should even be linked with the provincial sales tax. So as far as the views of the opposition are concerned, we can more or less disregard some of the comments that have been made up—

1610

Mr Stockwell: Where's your chapter and verse?

Mr Drainville: I would be glad to do that. Both parties will have chapter and verse tomorrow.

When we speak about taxation, we have to speak about the philosophy of how taxation is going to affect the reality of the society in which we live. The question in terms of taxation is: Who pays? As we go across this province and speak to the people of Ontario, we see that people across this province have indicated that they know who is going to pay, and it is not going to be the wealthy and the rich, who are traditionally supportive of the opposition parties. It is not going to be those people who are going to pay; it is going to be the lower-income people and the middle-income people of this province. That is why we are against this.

In terms of the selling of the GST, will we ever forget those immortal words of the Prime Minister of this country—Progressive Conservative Prime Minister, I might add—who said on 23 August 1989, "We will proceed with the sales tax not because it is popular, but because it is right for the country."

If you were to go across this province and speak to the people of this province about this tax, what would they say? Yes, it is unpopular; that is one point of agreement they would have with the Prime Minister of this country. But they do not believe it is right for this country, and we do not believe it is right in Ontario, and that is why we brought this bill into this House.

There have been great, grandstanding statements about the lack of revolt. I have to say, as I look across at the opposition, I am looking for the revolt over there. There is no revolt. Yet here on this side we in the government have been willing from the beginning to set forth our views in terms of Bill 1 and to indicate our fundamental disagreement with the federal government and with the opposition parties on this very issue.

An Agenda for People is being held up; the honourable member should hold that up, because it is a very important document in the lives of the people of Ontario.

I want to bring this debate down to a couple of issues that need to be looked at in terms of what has been said by the member for Ottawa-Rideau. The member spoke about leadership, the member spoke about protest, the member spoke about many issues—taxation without representation was even raised. We go back two centuries in terms of our political development to see that even this government, according to the member, is not following the honoured traditions of this country and this province. Let's talk about this.

In the last number of days we have heard opposition speaker after speaker saying to the government, "You don't keep your promises." Let me tell members about those promises. We began at the beginning of the GST debate—in terms of our federal party in Ottawa and our own party here in Ontario—and what did we see? Right from the beginning we said this tax is unfair, that it will hurt people with lower incomes and middle incomes and that we do not accept that this tax should be allowed to exist in this province. We have fought it since the beginning. We fought it during the election. We have not wavered. We have not discontinued that policy. If there is a promise that we are proud to keep it is that we will fight the GST to the last possible moment of its implementation.

We hear the opposition parties day after day, in the lugubrious outpourings of their bile, say to us that they are upset that we are not governing, that we are not taking action immediately on these issues. No wonder they are upset. We look at the Progressive Conservatives and their view on taxation. We hear, day after day, their support for landlords when we, on this side of the House, have supported since the beginning those tenants who were in need.

It is the same with the GST. Whose interests are we going to support in this House? Are we going to support the interest of the privileged, of the powerful, of the wealthy? If we are, then we go the route of the Progressive Conservative Party or of the Liberal Party. But no, the people of Ontario have said it is the NDP they have asked to lead them. It is their party that will lead them, fighting the GST all the way to the end.

Let me speak also about wealth. We know that one of the reasons the GST is unacceptable is because it does not hit those who need to be taxed. Now, if we are going to see the taxation issue continue, we are going to have to begin right where we are, saying that the GST cannot, in any way, be acceptable to our form of taxation. It is regressive in every sense, it is punitive and it is unacceptable to this government. That is why we are going in the direction we are.

I thank the honourable members for their support. It is about time they found out that the people of Ontario need that support. I say to the honourable members of the opposition that in terms of their views of no revolt, let them be very clear this day and from this day on that the revolt was joined during the election. We knew where they were. Now they know where we are.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We have just witnessed a very dramatic performance. I still do not have the answer on how this government will fight the tax. It must be with speeches, because that is all I have seen to this point. I am going to continue to resent, and my party resents, that members of this party, the NDP, continue day after day in this House to talk about themselves as being the only people in this province interested in people.

Every single member in this House represents people, and every single member in this House who is a politician is here to serve. The members of this party who continue to say they are the only ones interested in the poor should come to constituency offices around this province. I certainly resent the statements of the member for Victoria-Haliburton; I think he can do much better.

Mr Daigeler: The point I am raising is perhaps one of a somewhat delicate nature. I am not a clergyman myself; nevertheless, I am a theologian and have a rather extensive background in that field and I think perhaps I am permitted to make this comment.

The member for Victoria-Haliburton certainly has every right to dress whichever way he wants, but I think he has to decide whether he wants to be in the House as a politician or as a clergyman. In the remarks he makes, we will attack him, criticize him as an MPP. However, many people watch us on television and I think they will be confused in their views about the way the member is representing himself with the collar as a representative of another profession. In my opinion, it would be the proper thing to be in this House as an MPP.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The discussion is on the principle of the bill and not on personality.

Mr Drainville: Mr Speaker, if I might rise on a point of privilege. I think there was an imputation that needs to be corrected for the member. Let me say this: The people of Victoria-Haliburton elected an Anglican priest to be their representative. I am proud to be both their representative and an Anglican priest and I am proud to wear the collar. If that offends the honourable member, that is too bad.

1620

Mr Mahoney: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I tread into this with some trepidation with an honoured theologian and a man of the cloth. I do not know. Having attended a Catholic boarding school, where all they did was beat me up a few times—

Interjection.

Mr Mahoney: I am not allowed to talk about my background, apparently. Okay.

I fully respect the member's profession and background and point of view, but I am curious, because his

Premier said he was going to lead a national revolt. Those are not our words. He stood over here and shouted at David Peterson that he should stop free trade. Yet when the shoe was on the other foot, it seems to me that—help me, Mr Speaker, if my memory fails me—the honourable member was one of the people who was arrested at Temagami and issued a press release on parliamentary assistant letterhead, I believe, which may be inappropriate, stating how proud he was to have been put in the slammer.

I do not understand: If the member believes in that sort of philosophy of lying down in front of the bulldozers, why does he not chain himself to the Peace Tower? Why does he not go off to Ottawa in some great cloud of dust and some of the member for Etobicoke West's smoke and some of the member for Yorkview's nonsense and say: "We're not going to take it any more. We're fed up and we're angry and we're not going to take it any more"? I do not see that. What I see is the member defending a backup position of his Premier and his minister, who are not prepared to live up to statements they made before they were elected to the job they hold.

Mr Perruzza: I have sat in this House, as the member for Yorkview has suggested, for several weeks now and we have engaged in a number of debates with both the official opposition and the third party. I cannot help but think, when I see a bill like this, that this is a revolt. This government is sticking to a commitment it made during an election campaign, which in many ways I see as a revolt on many fronts.

We had the Liberals sitting on this side of the House. When that revolt began at the end of July, they were 94 members strong. When that revolt carried through into September, they had been reduced to—excuse the expression—a handful of hecklers. I have not heard one concrete, positive suggestion come from that side of the House. I remember when the Premier was campaigning throughout this province—

Mr Stockwell: Pay for the stationery. That's a concrete suggestion.

Mr Perruzza: If members would like some, I will get them some on a good deal. By the way, it was tax-free.

I remember the Premier at the time, during the election campaign, tramping through this province. He came through this province on an iron horse. He jumped on a train, which he intended to steamroll—

The Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr McClelland: It is a pleasure to participate again today in debate in the House. I want to address a few comments to the debate before us on second reading of Bill 1.

This bill touches on the retail sales tax. As has been said by my colleague the member for Ottawa-Rideau, we have to ask some questions about what is taking place here in light of the many promises and indeed the impression that was created by the government during the time of the campaign leading up to 6 September. Prior to that, I sat here for some time and listened at length to people—who are now sitting, many of them in cabinet on these very

benches—talking of all the wonderful things they were going to do to protect the average working person of Ontario.

I might add, as my colleague the member for Ottawa-Rideau has said, that I too take exception to the suggestion that was made again today as I watched and listened on TV, the sense that only people who sit on the government side are sensitive to people's needs.

I want to tell members for a moment about the people who have called and come into my office, the people of Brampton North who have been in the past few weeks talking about taxes and the opportunity to address things in a real economic way in this province. We are talking about real people who may or may not have voted NDP, real people who may not even be able to vote because of their citizenship, people who may have voted for the so-called fringe parties, people who voted Progressive Conservative, and some, yes, who voted Liberal, but those people are real people who count on us to come here and represent them and do a job to the best of our ability and believe that principles of integrity and honesty work here.

It has been said before. It would be totally improper to suggest that anybody, because of his religious convictions or lack thereof—to the same degree that those of us who espouse a particular political philosophy do not preclude of necessity anybody, however they vote and wherever they live, whatever their income or social position is. We are here together to do a job for them. I think we had better understand that fundamentally, if there is going to be a sense of working together.

The invitation of the Premier in this House was to work together for a constructive session of Parliament. We had better understand that we are here on the basis of the opportunity given to us and the responsibility given to us to discharge our duties in serving people in our community without regard to how they voted, where they come from or whether they voted at all.

When I hear of the wonderful things that are going to be done economically by this new government—Bill 1, of course, is the first, and we will see much more come in the near future—

Mr Harnick: After the moratorium.

Mr McClelland: I appreciate that. I was just going to say after the hold is removed, the freeze is gone. It reminds me of the fellow who was so despairing over a situation in his life that he jumped from a high-rise, and as he got about halfway down somebody saw him coming down and yelled, "How's it going?" He said, "Not bad so far." I really wonder what is going to happen when we come crashing down and they have to come to the reality that much of what they promised people are going to expect them to deliver on.

Bill 1 is an example of something that is not, I think, substantively contrary to what they promised in their election, but I think the impression was created that they were really going to do something totally different, that only the New Democrats had the answers to all of the woes and ills that befall society, things ranging from economic problems

to environmental problems, to health care, to finances that affect people in a very real way.

When we are talking about the economy and finances, we are talking about real people. We are talking about the people you have been elected to serve and I have been elected to serve. We are talking about people like a 57-year-old man who contacted me at home during the weekend past. He is a skilled labourer who has enjoyed prosperity in the past number of years, who lived in Brampton and enjoyed, quite frankly, an economy for the past few years that had an employment problem. Our difficulty in the past few years in Brampton was not one of unemployment, it was one of employment; we could not find enough people to fill the jobs that were available in our community.

But that is beginning to change, and in light of that change people are saying: "What is the government going to do to help us? What's going to happen so that I don't have to worry about a bleak Christmas?" One individual represents many others, but this particular man, 57 years of age, still is not knowing where to turn.

1630

There are others. I have received more phone calls and had more people come into my constituency office over the past number of weeks than in my previous three years with respect to the economic crunch that they are feeling. That is not a problem that was born solely because of the changes on 6 September. Let's be realistic. The question that remains in the minds of people is, "What is this government going to do to help us?"

I want to talk about what is happening with Bill 1. The new government has said essentially that it is going to address the retail sales tax. In simplistic terms—and I think people watching will be caught up in some of the jargon we talk about; let's kind of walk through this. You go out and buy an item now for \$10 and you have your 80 cents put on it, provincial sales tax. What is going to happen with the goods and services tax is that 7% tax will be put on, and the New Democratic Party is saying, "We are not going to stack the provincial sales tax on top of that; we're going to put it beside the base price." That base price unit will do the parallel tax. That has an impact economically. It certainly puts money into the pockets of the consumers of the province.

But I want to contrast that—and reference was made by my friend the member for Ottawa-Rideau—with respect to what would have happened if the New Democratic Party had done something that was quite simple, and that was to reduce the sales tax. I am not going to take issue philosophically with whether they put it on top, put it beside or put it on top, having reduced the sales tax, because at the end of the day it is still going to provide some money to the people of the province at a time when we need to stimulate the economy.

What I want to talk about for a moment is a sector of this society that I think we have to pay heed to—I am going to take the position now that I hope the members will listen to, those who are sitting opposite—who, members may be surprised to know, are real people too. Some of them voted for the NDP, many of them voted for the

NDP. That is the small business person—the person who runs the small shop, the individual who together with perhaps mother and daughter runs a small shop at the corner, those who are employed, creating the vast majority of jobs for people graduating from our high schools and community colleges.

As we look at the application of this tax, I think that what we have to do is ask ourselves what consideration is being given to what may seem to the government to be a very simplistic problem but is the practical problem that businesses have in administering taxes. The government has provided, happily, a little bump-up in terms of the tax that they are able to maintain as the cost of doing business, if you will, the first percentage that need not be remitted to the Treasury.

As businesses are gearing up for the implementation of the GST, they want to know clearly how they can do that in a smooth transition and provide their staff with the means of collecting tax and then remitting it. I raise that simply to say to the government that there is an issue of consideration with respect to the small business sector and the small business community across this province. They want to work in harmony with the government of the day, whatever government that is, but I want my friends the members opposite to be very aware that they are a voice that needs to be heard.

We are talking about economics, we are talking about taxes. The bill that is before us on second reading today touches on a specific tax: provincial sales tax. It brings tremendous revenue to the province of Ontario, but with that revenue is also opportunity to do things for people.

I want to talk about Brampton for a very brief moment. In 1989 we had applications in Brampton in terms of social assistance in the month of October of some 1,970, approximately 2,000. This month there were 3,107 who applied for social assistance in the region of Peel. One might ask what relevance that has to the tax that we are talking about today in the bill. Let me address that rhetorical question. The question is about people in need in our communities. The question is about a government that said: "We are going to fight a tax because we believe it will hurt people. It's the wrong tax at the wrong time."

I have a very interesting view of the GST. I will be happy to share it with members some time. I happen to believe that we need fundamental tax reform in this country and, indeed, I would be happy to see some fundamental tax reform. But the government told the people of this province that it was going to make sure that they were not subject to this tax. Now what the government is saying is, and it has been said before by my colleagues: "We'll pick up on it because it's convenient. We're going to change it a little bit, we are going to put a little bit of a different twist on it. We are going to do a parallel, as opposed to an on-top, tax but we are really going to run with this."

I think people are asking, "When are you going to come forward and when are you going to lie down in front of the bulldozers or whatever you feel it is appropriate to do?" I do not say that in a trite, offhand sense; I say that in a sense of people wanting to know what the minister is

going to do to help them. Is this an indicator of his commitment to fight for the people who believed that they were going to have him in their corner fighting for them? It seems to me that a lot of people are going to be disappointed if this is the message that is being sent to them across the province.

There are a number of communities right across Ontario who are hurting very, very badly at the present time. There are one-industry towns that are in jeopardy. Today, my friend from the riding of Algoma-Manitoulin raised the issue of how many people are out of work in the forestry industry.

The GST, with its implementation, and the lack of clarity, the lack of understanding that people have with respect to it, the fear that is creating the uncertainty, at economic times, when they are already faced, clearly, with recession, compounded by the uncertainty of a government that says, "We are not really sure about how we are going to fight it, we are not sure what we are going to do," adds to that kind of difficulty, that sense of despair that people are feeling economically. They are looking to him for leadership. They are looking to him to say, "Here is what we are going to do to help."

Bill 1 sends a very, very plain signal to people. It says we are going to do a few little things on the fringes, we are going to make an adjustment here and an adjustment there, but we are not prepared to deal with taxation that we said we would deal with in a head-on, fundamental way.

It seems to be that this is true in the case of the act to amend the retail sales tax. How much more are they going to have to, if I can use the word, compromise the positions that they took across this province on other matters that are much more plain? The Premier said very, very clearly in unqualified terms, without qualification, "We will have nothing to do with this and we will stop it." Today we are debating a bill that says: "We cannot stop it, really. We recognize that reality."

The member for Victoria-Haliburton says they will fight to the dying day, right to the last moment. And let this be marked today in the Legislature: This party, the New Democratic Party, is going to fight it henceforth. That fight will continue.

Rhetoric is great. It is easy for any one of us to stand up and express his displeasure, but having said that, I think people are going to say they appreciate the government's position, they respect its position, "But what are you going to do? How are you going to help me? Is this going to find me a job? Is it going to create jobs in my community?" Is it going to help the agriculture sector, I say to the Speaker? Is it going to help people in Hamilton who are facing layoffs as the steel industry faces difficulty upon difficulty compounded by the taxes that are coming at a very inopportune time? People in the north, where communities are suffering, is it going to do something for them?

Is this the message, is this the signal that is being sent by the current government? "We really cannot do a whole lot. We are just going to fine-tune what has already taken place."

The Retail Sales Tax Act is very important for a variety of reasons. One of the fundamental reasons, as I have said,

is that it impacts people on a day-to-day basis. It impacts small business people who are collecting the tax, it impacts consumers, manufacturers, those who create jobs; impacts the jobless, the homeless; it impacts people in every corner of Ontario.

I hope that as we conclude this debate, whenever it may be today, we would hear forthcoming from the government benches a sense not of rhetoric in a sense of saying, "This is how we're going to fight this terrible tax," this goods and services tax that they are so opposed to and have stated clearly that they are opposed to, but they would say in addition to that, "We want to provide some concrete direction for this province."

1640

There are people in my community and in communities represented by every member here who are worried, who are uncertain about what is going to happen. The first of January 1991 will roll around 27 days from now. It is apparent that the goods and services tax will be in place. There is already tremendous stretch, strain on the economic fabric of our province, indeed our country, but in this province the new government has an opportunity to put some elasticity back into that so that it will not stretch to the breaking point. The Minister of Revenue has brought forward a bill and we understand the principle and the rationale for it. We will be supporting it in second reading because we think that it is making a cut, in part, for the consumer of this province.

I raise again the issue, by way of contrast, of if we taken that 1% and knocked it off the provincial sales tax, injected \$1.1 billion into the economy now. If people knew that \$1.1 billion was going to be there, created or saved 15,000 jobs, perhaps some of them in the forest industry, that may have prevented the individual who came in to see me, that 56-year-old gentleman who does not have a job, perhaps people from Cochrane South, I say to my friend who is shaking his head. Maybe those 15,000 jobs would have affected his community. Maybe some of them would have helped people there.

I think that it is important that we consider what else can be done in light of this. We need to move forward with a concrete plan, move forward with an economic agenda that we want to see forthcoming from the government that is going to create jobs at a time when the goods and services tax is going to put a damper on an already stagnant economy. So I say that as we proceed with this debate I would hope that our friends opposite would be prepared to indicate in their response what else they might be able to do.

With respect to Bill 1, which is before us, my friend the member for Ottawa-Rideau very clearly and very ably set out some of the problems with it, some of the deficiencies that we feel are there. I think the fundamental deficiency is this—and in conclusion I want to draw this point to the attention of the people of Ontario and this House. People look at this very, very symbolically. The mechanics of it, I think, are problematic in terms of the small business community, and I have a very real concern about that. I would urge the government as it deliberates and brings legislation forward to make that a very, very

important factor in determining what kind of legislation it is going to bring forward and how it is going to implement it.

But the symbolism that is contained herein that says, "We're going to deal with this not exactly the way we told you we were going to deal with it," says to the people of Ontario: "What have we got here? What gives? What's going to happen? They promised us that they were going to fight this. They promised us they would have nothing to do with it. They promised us that they were going to protect us from all of the ills that befall society."

Quite frankly, I wish them well. I hope that they are able to do all of the wonderful things that they have promised. Apparently they have all the answers for all the problems in the world and I hope they can deliver on some of them. The GST was one of them, one promise that they were going to deliver on. They were going to take care of it. They were going to make sure it was not going to happen. They were going to protect the people in Brampton, in Cochrane South, in Hamilton, in the north. They were going to take care of them. They were going to make sure that the GST did not hurt them any further.

The people who are hurting, people who are out of work, who will have a very bleak Christmas and no good prospects for the year 1991, who were represented on the shop floor by the government members—I see my friend opposite who did that and did that ably—are now saying: "What's going to happen? What are you going to do? Is this a message? Are you going to just cave in? Are you just going to pick things up and go along with a nice little twist that really does not do anything to help us in a significant way? Could you not have done more? Could you have seized this as an opportunity to really put some teeth into what you said you were going to do?"

I ask them again and I say that is the question that the people of Ontario, the people in Brampton North are wondering about, "What is this government going to do to help us?" They said that they were going to stop the GST. They have talked about it very eloquently, I might say. Our friend the member for Victoria-Haliburton stood up and with—

Interjection.

Mr McClelland: Well, I would not want to use the expression the member for Mississauga East used, and I hope Hansard did not pick that up. The member for Victoria-Haliburton very ably put forward his position and he has obviously had much opportunity to put forth a variety of inspirational messages in the past. I am inspired and encouraged by what he said today.

Again, we are talking about this bill. This is the story of the clergyman—and believe me, if members bear with me, there is some relevance—who attended one of his parishioners who was really not doing well at all. Unhappily, he was about to pass on. I think I may have told this story once before to the House. He talked to the clergyman and said:

"I wonder if you could call my physician and my solicitor to my bedside. I want to charge the three of you with a very important responsibility."

This supposedly average citizen in the parish turned out to be quite wealthy, but in fact he had stored all of his money underneath his bed. He was, in a word, a miser and had tucked away the money. Upon his imminent demise, he called his clergyman, solicitor and physician together and said:

"Now, I know I am not long for this world, but I am going to charge you with an interesting responsibility. I am going to put \$200,000 into three different envelopes and I am going to give you one each. I want to prove that in fact you can take it with you. I want you to put this money on top of my coffin as they lower me into the ground."

Of course it was pledged to the dying that they would do this. As it was inevitable, the man passed on and the three people attended the funeral and three envelopes were very discreetly deposited into the grave. But on the way back, the clergyman's conscience, as you would expect, was bothering him and he was obviously the most likely to first confess. He said to his colleagues:

"I have to tell you something. There is \$200,000, but the church really needs a new furnace and I pulled \$50,000 out of that envelope. But I did not think it would really matter because it was, after all, going to service in the community, a good cause."

The physician, whose conscience was somewhat bothered by this, said:

"Well, I have to confess too. I took \$100,000 of the \$200,000 out of the envelope and I only deposited \$100,000. But the \$100,000 that I took I used to furnish the nursery at the new hospital, because that hospital desperately needed a new nursery." They undoubtedly blamed it on the previous government and said that they had not provided enough transfer payments.

The lawyer said:

"I am really, really disappointed in you two gentlemen. I want to tell you that I deposited a cheque for the full amount with the casket."

I see the member for Victoria-Haliburton chuckling.

Maybe there is a little message in there. Maybe the people of Ontario are wondering, was the cheque deposited or was it the real goods? I think they are going to be asking themselves, is this government prepared to deliver on what they said they were going to do? They made some pledges. They said that they were going to do all kinds of wonderful things; they have not done them. Bill 1 is evidence of that. I think Bill 1 stands, in effect, as a first opportunity for them to send a message to the people of Ontario, an opportunity to clearly stake out their ground with their friends in Ottawa—maybe they are not their friends, but the government in Ottawa—and let them know where they are coming from. They have not done it.

I say to them that as we proceed with this debate, and as other legislation comes forward, the people of Ontario want to know, what are they going to do to live up to their promise? What are they going to do to fight this scourge of the GST, as they have titled it?

I look forward to hearing what might be done in the future. Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to participate.

1650

Mr B. Ward: I would like to thank my good friend the member for Brampton North on his good speech. He was very calm and collected in his thoughts, and I think that is the way the debate should be in this House.

However, he did make reference to the potential \$1.1 billion sales tax cut that was proposed during the recent election. It was made reference to a couple of times in the speeches by the opposition party about what should be done to put money in the pockets of the people of Ontario.

I would like to point out that what they failed to explain is that their policy would have been to tax the goods and services tax. So while they are giving \$1.1 billion to the people of Ontario on one hand, they are taking \$500 million away on the other hand, leaving a net \$600-million increase that goes to the people of Ontario.

I would like to point out that we have gone better than that, that we are putting \$700 million of new money into the economy through constructive work in our municipalities. I think that is the appropriate way to go, the best way to go for the people of Ontario in this case.

Mr Hope: There are a couple of good things I want to bring out. Number one is, we do have small businesses out there that are petrified at what is going on. They understand the ramifications of the goods and services tax. They do know that when the goods and services tax comes in, their business is probably going to go away. But they have been a part of the coalition group that has been formed in Ontario to fight the goods and services tax. They have been very instrumental in this.

But I think the opposition has been so adapted to seeing people with signs and lying in front of trucks and lying in front of bulldozers and I think the people of Ontario are tired of doing that. A lot of people are proud to see that we are not piggybacking on the fault of the federal government. At least they have a government that is trying to help out a little bit and making some changes within the realm where it can make the changes. I think the people are going to somewhat welcome this. Yes, it is not everything we want in killing the goods and service tax, but I think in two years, when we have an election, if we do have an election, there may be some changes that will kill that incident.

I think the whole thing is that we have a major issue out there with the goods and services tax. It is one step our government is doing. We do not want to have to mobilize people again to come to Queen's Park, to go to Ottawa. People are getting tired of it. What they are looking for is a government to at least try to assist in some way to make changes within its power, to have a little bit of respect and put a little bit more money into their pockets and not into the pockets of the government or corporations.

Mrs Sullivan: I want to comment on the remarks of the member for Brampton North, who I thought was very articulate and energetic in his discussions relating to Bill 1. I particularly appreciated his eloquence in discussing the work of all of the members in the House to forward legislative matters, and the integrity and the work that is required of us applies to all members. There is no corner on

integrity by any party or any area in the House. I thought that they were useful reminders, particularly for new members.

I also thought that he spoke very practically about the impact of this bill in combination with the GST on small business in Ontario. We know that small businesses are the largest employers in the province. It is a sector that is already hurting in a downturn economy. We know that the GST, and in fact this bill in conjunction with the GST, will add new demands to their particular burdens at this time of economic life. We know that their administrative costs will increase. We know that those administrative costs, whether they be in adding personnel or in the addition of new machines, will be substantially more demanding with the GST coming on board.

I think the member has indicated that some of the paralleling that is being done in this bill simplifies some of the problems that small business will have, but I guarantee members that this bill will not solve those problems. Frankly I would like to have seen, along with the member for Brampton North, additional fight and additional spirit from the Minister of Revenue in terms of ensuring that our small businesses did not hurt as much as it appeared that they were going to with the GST.

Mr McClelland: I want to say to my friend the member for Brantford, who said I was calm and so forth today, I appreciate that because I look over and see those smiling faces and it is easy to relax. But, believe me, there might be an opportunity, and when the time comes, members may be surprised to see a different reaction from time to time.

But I do want to say to my friend the member for Brantford that we are given a tremendous amount of latitude in this House from time to time and we are often allowed to say things that are on our minds. As members will notice from the comments that I made, we are even allowed to wander a fair bit. But one of the things that people expect is for us to be relatively accurate.

For the sake of the record, I want the record to show that I appreciate what the member is trying to say, but the \$1.1 billion is a net benefit if it is reduced by 1%. With respect to what the member talked about, I think it is important, given the latitude that we are allowed in this House, and I want to correct what the member put on the record, that it would have been \$1.1 billion net, 15,000 jobs created and/or saved net in this province with the reduction of 1% on the sales tax. Having regard to what the member said, the rest of it I think makes sense, and I understand what he is saying.

I say to my friend the member for Chatham-Kent, when he was representing people in the union, they wanted his help. He is going to find in this place from time to time that he is going to be able to help some of the people most of the time a little bit. Some of the people are going to be helped entirely. They do not want a little bit of help. The member said that. He is going to help them a little bit. They did not ask for a little bit of help. He promised to help them totally, and they are saying to him: "We elected you not to help us a little bit. We elected you to help us all the way because that is what you promised." So I say to

my friend the member for Chatham-Kent, a little bit will not do in this case.

Mr Mahoney: Come on, stay calm.

Mr Sutherland: Just to respond to the member for Mississauga West, I am certainly going to try to follow in the footsteps of the member for Brampton North and remain calm and collected and leave a sense of decorum here in the House today.

It is a pleasure for me to speak today on the first bill that we have the opportunity of dealing with in this House, particularly again to speak on behalf of the people of Oxford, who were very kind to send me to this House.

I want to talk about several things related to the bill. I want to talk a bit about GST. I want to talk a bit about taxation. I would like to talk a little bit about some of the areas that the member for Brampton North also mentioned in terms of the effects of taxation on small business and deal with some of the other initiatives.

I think there is general agreement, we have heard today there is general agreement, that all three parties dislike the GST, that we think it is a bad tax, that we think it is the wrong tax at the wrong time and that it is not in the best interests of this country and certainly not in the best interests of this province.

The members of the opposition have pointed out that the Premier said during the campaign that he would lead a national revolt against the GST. The members of the opposition have also said in their arguments today that they do not believe this government has done anything to fight the GST and do not believe that the action in this bill is enough.

I would like to remind the members of the opposition that this government has joined in a legal battle to fight the GST. My friends opposite here and from the Liberal Party have talked quite a bit, saying that we were not doing anything about it. They brought up the example of free trade and they talked about how our Premier, the former Leader of the Opposition at the time, called upon the former Premier, Mr Peterson, to fight the free trade agreement. Mr Peterson, in the 1987 election, said he would fight the free trade agreement. Once Mr Peterson got his majority, what were his comments? There was nothing he could do.

1700

There is a distinct difference between what our Premier has done and what the past Premier has done. Our Premier, cabinet, caucus and this government have decided to engage in a legal battle in the courts to oppose the GST. Now maybe the members of the opposition do not have a lot of respect for the judicial system in this country or do not feel that this is a very significant way of fighting the goods and services tax, but I would think that when it boils down to everything, we all must respect the laws and the courts in this country. We must have very high regard for that. So I would hardly call a legal battle an insignificant act in fighting the GST.

As a matter of fact, it is a very significant act because it clearly states and clearly outlines what the position of this government is in relation to the GST. We do

not believe they have the authority to collect the GST. They are interfering in provincial territory and we are taking them to court to fight that.

I do think that is an important point to be put on the record. I guess it comes down to a definition of how you define national revolt. The people over there in the opposition have suggested that maybe some of our members should go and chain themselves to the Peace Tower and do other things of that nature. I just do not believe that members of the opposition should belittle what a legal battle is and how that states what this government wants to do.

I hardly think the members of the Liberal opposition have a great deal of credibility on this issue in trying to tell us or trying to suggest that we are not doing enough on it. They said they opposed the GST as well. What were they going to do? They were going to charge the GST on top of the provincial sales tax. I am very happy that the Minister of Revenue and this government have seen fit to change that and that we will not be charging the provincial sales tax on top of the GST. We will only be charging it as it normally was on the base rate.

Clearly, that is a significant difference again from what the Liberals were saying. They were saying they opposed the GST, but to use the term that I believe was used earlier by the member for Ottawa-Rideau, they were going to harmonize the GST and the provincial sales tax. So, as I stated earlier, clearly the members of the Liberal opposition do not have a great deal of credibility in trying to say this government is not doing anything on the GST.

I am very happy to see that the member for Etobicoke West, in representing the Conservative Party, has said that his party supports the initiatives in this legislation and primarily the initiative not to charge the GST on top of the provincial sales tax. I am very happy that the member for Etobicoke West is supporting us. I think all of us should probably make a note of that and see how many times that may happen again during this term of the Legislature.

I think some of the other initiatives that the Minister of Revenue has brought forward in this bill are also encouraging. The fact that the minister and the ministry have recognized the impact that this is going to have on the business community and particularly small business people by giving them extra percentages for collecting sales tax and for some of the other things that have been initiated relating to audits and refunds, giving them an extended time to deal with those issues, were very positive initiatives in trying to make this bill have less effect on the people of Ontario.

Clearly, there is only so much this government can do. We are certainly trying. Many people who are members of this caucus, as has already been mentioned, were very active in many groups throughout this province who were trying to form a coalition to oppose the GST. They have stated those opinions on many occasions.

As to whether we can deal with all the issues related to it, only time is really going to tell. But we have clearly stated our opposition to the GST and we are taking action on it, unlike the Liberals were doing when they were in power.

I want to come back to the comments about what our colleague the member for Brampton North was talking about. I am talking about the issues of taxation affecting small business. I too—and it might be to the surprise of the member for Brampton North—am very concerned about issues of taxation on small business. I really do feel that many members of my caucus are as well.

While the members of the third party constantly talk about taxation, how high taxes are, and on and on, yes, some of the small business people I talk to are concerned about taxation. But I think what they are really concerned about is the question of how much work is involved in remitting their taxes.

I certainly hope that when the Fair Tax Commission is established, all of us, whether from this side or from the other parties, can look at ways of how we can simplify this process for small business people so we can make it much easier for them to figure out the amount of taxes that they must remit and cut down on some of the paperwork. Clearly, a lot of the accounting procedures and other things that they have to do to be able to figure out the amount of tax they have to remit takes a lot of time, takes a lot of money.

I think we would all agree that the federal GST is a prime example of creating a whole new bureaucracy, an accounting nightmare for many businesses. I have heard many of them talk about how they have had to get entire new computer programs to be able to figure out the GST and how costly that is going to be to their businesses, primarily small businesses.

That is an issue that all of us are going to have to address in the future. I certainly hope the role of the Fair Tax Commission will be to examine that issue closely and that we will receive lots of input from the small business people in this province.

There are a lot of other issues here that have been mentioned today about taxation in general. We heard calls for tax reform from members of the Liberal Party. It was quite interesting because we certainly know that in their five years, three years in majority government, there was ample time to put proposals forward on widespread tax reform, but I do not recall seeing any of those proposals come forward.

Again, here we have another issue where the opposition is saying one thing now, but did not act upon that thing when it was in government. I realize the role of the opposition is trying to point out faults in the legislation and trying to point out problems, but I do believe that the opposition also has an obligation to try to be consistent in its criticisms.

I also have not heard a lot of constructive suggestions. We have heard what the problems are in this legislation, but we have not heard a lot of alternatives from the opposition. I think it is important as well when you are criticizing things that you certainly propose alternatives, as I fundamentally believe our party did during the election campaign. When we presented *An Agenda for People*, we were presenting a platform of reform, an agenda of what this government wanted to do if it was elected. I think that is one reason why the people of Ontario responded to our party rather than to the third party.

During the election campaign, all the members of the third party talked about was taxation—taxes were too high. The members of the third party seem to have a rather simple outlook about life and how everything operates. They could not put their collective minds together to come up with a genuine platform that the people of Ontario would endorse. As a result of that, the people of Ontario clearly rejected them during the campaign. As you can see, they remain the third party.

I also think, if you look at the issues related in the campaign and what we said about taxation in general, we talked about fair taxation. I mentioned earlier that I hope, once the commission is established and is up and operating in the new year, will look at—all kinds of issues of fair taxation, not only the ones about what small businesses must do in terms of accounting procedure. There are a lot of other areas where I personally feel we need to make a lot of changes on taxation issues.

1710

I think these are most of the comments I wanted to make today on this piece of legislation. Again, I want to compliment the Minister of Revenue, her staff and the cabinet for proposing this as the first piece of legislation. I think it is very significant that this is the first piece of legislation from our government, being our first time in government. It is a clear commitment to the issues we outlined in the campaign when we said that we would not charge the provincial sales tax on top of the GST.

Clearly, when this legislation is passed, the people of Ontario will know that this is a government of integrity and that it is working to keep its promises to the people.

Mr Ruprecht: I listened quite intently and with a certain respect to the member for Oxford and the member for Brantford, and these are honourable gentlemen, but that is the very term Mark Antony described before these kinds of honourable gentlemen stuck the knife into Caesar's back.

What did these honourable gentlemen and honourable women promise the people of Ontario? What was the promise? A tax reform or a tax revolt. There is nothing that this government can be happy about and certainly proud about when it is talking about this specific bill and this specific piece of legislation. I cannot think that they can be proud. In fact, they should be ashamed of themselves because they did not keep the promise.

They promised the taxpayers of Ontario that they would fight. Is this what they call fighting? I call this sticking the knife deeper and deeper into the backs of the already taxpaying public of this province. Do they want to be proud of this fact that they are even continuing to maintain harmony with the new GST? Are they going to be proud of the fact that they are increasing the bankruptcies that are going to happen in terms of more people being on the dole? Is this the kind of pride they are going to show?

My friends made a solemn promise to the people of Ontario and they did not keep it, and consequently I think they can take no pride in trying to mitigate that promise by simply saying: "We're trying to do the best we can. We're trying to be reasonable people."

This GST is not reasonable. This bill is not reasonable. We expect them to stand up and fight and lead the tax revolt that they promised the people of Ontario. Where is this NDP that said, "We'll fight"? Where are these guys who said to themselves, "If not, we're going to chain ourselves to the fences and to the posts"? Where are they now? They should stand up and be counted and reject the—

The Acting Speaker (Ms Haslam): Time.

Mr Daigeler: The honourable member for Oxford is taking great pride in this bill and is talking about the integrity of the government. However, I think, in fairness and in integrity, he should also mention that this bill, off the bat, adds \$500 million to the provincial deficit. I respect his decision and I respect the decision of his government and of the Treasurer to do that. He was elected to adjust the budget according to his own wishes, but I think he should not then stand up in this House and say: "Well, the former government and the bad Liberals left a big hole in the provincial Treasury and therefore we cannot afford to fund universities. We have to charge tuition fees for students."

The way the minister seemed to indicate this afternoon in question period, I think he should be up front and say, "Yes, we deliberately are adding \$500 million to the provincial deficit by taking this measure and that is the decision we have taken." I think he should mention that to the people of Ontario as well.

Mr McClelland: My new friend the member for Oxford made reference to the fact that he too is very concerned about the small business sector, as are some of his colleagues in government. I just want to say that the sentiment I have heard expressed around the province of late is that in the current economic state, without any clear direction or knowing where we are going, the way to get a small business going in Ontario is to start a big one and just wait.

Mr White: The member for Parkdale referred to Julius Caesar, Shakespeare's play, and I recall a passage from that where the question that Antony raised was, "Pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth, that I am gentle and meek with these butchers." This is in fact what has happened to the people of Ontario, to the people of Canada. After years and years of regressive taxes, which the GST represents, we have been butchered, and butchered again.

This is the first step on our government's part to introduce a fair tax system. It is symbolic that it is Bill 1. I think it incumbent upon the members opposite in the Liberal Party to remember that supposedly their confreres in the senate are battling that same tax. I am not sure if they recall that or not, but certainly this is an important step, this bill. But in and of itself it is only one step towards reintroducing a real sense of fairness in the taxation of the people of Ontario. Certainly, people in Ontario did not vote for us thinking that we were going to lower taxes. No one in our party said that. What we did say was that we would be introducing a fair tax system, and this is certainly the first step in that. I think the people of Ontario will be proud and will be grateful that this is our first act.

Mr Sutherland: I just want to deal with a couple of points that the member for Parkdale mentioned when he talked about harmonizing the provincial sales tax with the GST. I think that as a member who was part of the government, he also realized that as a government you have to be responsible. Let me say this: This government is not backing down on its commitment to fight the GST. We are going to fight it as much as we can. We are fighting it through the courts and we are going to fight it in other ways. But I also think it would be very irresponsible, if our battle is not successful, not to be prepared to deal with the fact that the GST could become a reality. Rather than saying that the minister is harmonizing here, I think the minister is being responsible and preparing should that occur.

I also want to deal with this issue about the \$500 million and whether we are being responsible by adding to the deficit. I believe we are being very responsible by ensuring that \$500 million stays in the pockets of the people of Ontario. As the Treasurer has stated, that is also part of our policy for helping to deal with the recession, along with the \$700 million that we are committing. That is going to help stimulate the economy.

The member for Etobicoke West even stated earlier that \$500 million is nothing to sneeze at, so I guess maybe his fellow member is beginning to sneeze at \$500 million and does not think that is significant in terms of helping to stimulate the economy of the province.

1720

Mr Conway: I appreciate the opportunity to engage in the debate on Bill 1 and I want to congratulate the member for Port Arthur on this, her first ministerial responsibility in so far as bringing legislation to the House is concerned.

I must say of my constituents, and I will speak largely for my constituents in eastern Ontario, that if there is one subject about which they would like me to express an opinion, I have to believe it is on the subject of the goods and services tax. I would certainly expect that before this debate is over, most members of the Legislature will want to avail themselves of the opportunity Bill 1 provides, which is of course an opportunity to express their views and their concerns about this particular tax and how the provincial retail sales tax will apply.

I was very interested in listening to what some of my friends opposite were saying about the policy of the government. I certainly respect the position that has been advanced and I really congratulate the government for coming forward in a way that is consistent with its electoral manifesto.

I listened very carefully to the member for Oxford and I heard him say what I heard my New Democratic opponents say in the election campaign. I thought it was very skilful what the New Democratic Party did with respect to this issue. They made very plain their views about how reprehensible it was to impose a tax on a tax and they congratulate, happily, the member for Port Arthur, the Minister of Revenue, who now gets to come into this House and to do what they said they would do.

In the debate during the election campaign, and quite frankly in most of this debate, I do not think I will hear very much about the pain of that position which, by the way, will not be borne by the Minister of Revenue, good person that she is. It is of course her silent partner, the member for Nickel Belt, who will really now have to wrestle with the downside of this decision, and the downside of this decision is to forgo \$500 million worth of existing revenue.

I know that will not trouble most people, and it probably should not, because that is why cabinet ministers are paid more than private members, and in this case the Treasurer, the member for Nickel Belt. He will really have some fun with this. Interestingly, on the basis of his statement yesterday, in the first few months he will apparently be able to fill the gap with a windfall from provincial income tax payable, which is up this year by about \$500 million.

I am prepared to suggest that a year from now the Treasurer will be, not here but in another place, the Frost Building, looking at data that will be probably the reverse, deeply, deeply discouraging information from the federal Department of Finance that will probably suggest that because the recession of 1990-1991, the winter particularly, was so much deeper than anything we had planned for, revenues on the personal income tax side will not be \$500 million above what had been projected, but in fact might be, as they were in 1981, 1982 and/or 1983, \$500 million to \$800 million below expectations.

So for the moment I would simply observe that what we have here is an initiative that is going to cost the Treasurer about \$500 million. One might say, how can that be? It is simply that this was, of course, some of the more sophisticated argumentation, which was not and could not really be advanced in something as colourful as an election campaign. But as honourable members will know, certainly as the Treasurer will know, for a long time the provincial sales tax in this province has applied to the federal manufacturers tax.

I simply observe that a consequence of this initiative will be to deny the Treasurer of Ontario roughly \$500 million of revenue that has been traditionally made available by that long-standing practice of a tax on a tax. That I do not expect will trouble very many people, but I know one person it will trouble. It will trouble in a real and big way the Treasurer, the member for Nickel Belt, because it may not appear to be very much, but I want to submit to my friends on both sides of the aisle that \$500 million is, at last report, more than the entire budget of the Ministry of the Environment, more than the entire budget of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, more than the entire budget for the Ministry of the Attorney General.

As I say, a year from now when as a result of this initiative, which I say again is consistent with what the members opposite advanced during the recent electoral campaign—I will be very interested to see six or eight or 12 months from now how in a new budget cycle—unlike some people over here, I am going to give time and opportunity to my friends opposite because I do not think it is fair to expect too much too soon. I think there should be

opportunity at least to the point of the next budget, because I know that my friends opposite are a very skilful, capable group who have made very significant commitments that in time they are going to want to keep, and they are going to want to pay for those promises.

I know that this is not Social Credit. I know that, as the Premier said on Wall Street a couple of weeks ago, they are going to be fiscally responsible. But a year from now as a result of this initiative, my guess is that revenue losses that are going to be very significant as a result of the recession, and the member for Nickel Belt, someone for whom I have the highest regard, is going to have to show himself to be more dexterous than I can imagine myself ever being, so I will be interested over time to see how that develops.

I am also, by the way, going to be interested to see as a result of this policy what the Minister of Revenue does over time when, as I suspect, we will get from the government of Canada a value-added-tax-included GST. That is really going to be interesting. It will not happen right away, but I suspect it will happen over time. I will say to the Minister of Revenue—not really today because it is not an issue for today, but the Premier rightly observes that this is a five-year mandate. I suspect that before the five-year mandate is out, I suspect that before 18 months has passed, we might very well have ourselves in Canada a VAT-included GST. Then I am going to be interested to see how the principle of Bill 1 applies in so far as Ontario is concerned.

I want to say a couple of other things about this bill and the principle to which it speaks, and for me, again, I am really concerned about its relationship to the goods and services tax. I say so as the duly elected member for one of the 130 electoral districts. I have been around for some 15 years. I have seen a number of taxes come and go, but I have never seen a public upset over a tax quite like I have seen over the GST, and I have to remind myself that the tax in most cases has not yet been felt. My sense is that the GST will produce a fire-storm. We have talked in parliaments about what the principle is, and I always enjoy listening to economists talk about fairness and equity.

In my really mischievous moments, and somebody earlier this afternoon talked about the Fair Tax Commission—I think it is a very good idea. It might start, for example, with market value assessment in certain communities where I think we have, in the antiseptic sense at least, a good database. It might be not entirely, but I think most reasonable people would agree that if you want to talk about fairness and equity in an antiseptic sense, I cannot think of a better place to start with for the Fair Tax Commission than market value assessment.

1730

My learned colleagues opposite will know why there has been some reluctance to proceed in that connection. I must say, one of the joyful realities of the new polity in Ontario is, as I said the other day, that the wheel has come full circle. All of the main parties will now have an experience in government. I think that will lead to a very significant maturation of the political debate in Ontario, because I well remember in a previous life having to do

something that I had not done as a private member. I remember having to defend certain taxes, and often, in cases where equity and fairness could not have been more abundantly clear, a lot of people who said they were for equity and fairness took to the hills like Che Guevara because they understood the reality of politics.

As I say, for my friends in the new government who are interested in equity and fairness, I think of one large urban community, for example, in the province. I cannot imagine that there will be much restraint in terms of market value assessment. Apostles of and advocates for fairness and justice in taxation might very well start with that proposition, because, as I say, an awful lot of good work has been done by a lot of very learned people over the years.

But back to the point about the GST. In my area of rural, small-town eastern Ontario, people are upset. They would want me to convey that sense of upset and rage over the GST in the course of this debate and I am pleased to do so on their behalf.

I really do think that this is the tax that is going to push a lot of people over the edge. I was struck, for example, in some of the analysis across the Atlantic, to realize that in fact it may have been the community charge which ended a government in Britain a couple of days ago. By all accounts, of the several ingredients that ended the Thatcher government, the community charge was perhaps the most significant issue in driving the members of the government caucus to a change, and a change that led to the resignation of the former Prime Minister.

When people in my part of Ontario, and certainly elsewhere in the province and country, start to pay this tax, when they start to realize that it is going to apply to funeral services, to reading materials that are not religious, to certain foods, to a host of daily items and inputs that have not been taxed before—in Pembroke, Petawawa and Killaloe they are mad already and they have not even started to pay this tax.

I think it is going to be very important for all politicians to understand this concern of tax burden. I have to say to my friends opposite that when in the Agenda for People the member for York South promised a tax revolt, some of the 19% of voters in North Renfrew who voted for the New Democratic candidate cited to me on the street that that was why they were going to support the very distinguished candidate for that party in my constituency. Because people were and are angry.

I am not going to rethrash the old straw about what kind of revolt constitutes a real revolt. Some of us over the last few years watched the now member for Brant-Haldimand engage in some pretty interesting tactics. I can appreciate how some of my friends might be excused for thinking that we might see a certain kind of behaviour to give effect to the commitment in the Agenda for People.

I saw the Premier—I think he was at the Ottawa airport—yesterday morning, as he gathered together with people like Mr Romanow and Ms McLaughlin and others to plan the NDP national approach, part of which appears to be an abandonment of the goods and services tax, I think an enormously popular position. And who knows?

We may be 18 to 34 months away from that day in the history of Canada when the member for Yukon will have her opportunity.

I only know this from my experience in government, that at the national level we continue to spend at well above our capacity to pay. My friends opposite will say that is because the system is not very fair. I would be very happy to see the goods and services tax abandoned. I would never accept an invitation to become the Minister of Finance for Canada, and I would resist very rigorously an invitation to become the Treasurer for Ontario, because I know something of the pressures that this bill will place on my good friend the member for Nickel Belt. They will get worse, not lighter.

My sense as well is that people are going to, as a result of this tax, begin to look very carefully at how it is we spend their money. I get a growing sense from my constituents—very good, hard working, self-reliant people, who are not very happy about some of the things I did on their behalf as a member and minister in the previous government—but I sense their tolerance for some patterns of government spending, which are in the theoretical sense very eminently supportable, losing a lot of its appeal as people look at the month-end pay stub. All they see is that as they work more and more, they do not seem to be moving ahead.

I want to take issue, quite frankly, with some of my friends opposite. In my area some of the most privileged people in the community are the most active supporters for the New Democratic Party, and that is as it should be. Many people who are well-off in an economic sense support me, but sometimes I hear in this House that our friends opposite—and one of my colleagues took umbrage at this earlier this afternoon—the sense is sometimes left by my friends opposite, and I know it is inadvertent, that they represent exclusively the poor and downtrodden.

I think the NDP over the decade has done quite a good job, particularly in advocating for a lot of those groups. But I can only again speak from personal, local experience. Some of the most economically well-off people in my constituency are the most able supporters of the New Democratic Party. I have always been struck by some of their views on tax reform. I think they are in for some interesting surprises.

I am all for fairness and equity. I want more, not less of it, and I am expecting that our friends opposite are going to be able to deliver what they have promised.

Again, it was suggested the other day that some people do not have access to government. I can only again speak for my five years in government, but some of their best friends over there had the best, easiest and highest-level access to our government, as they did to the previous Davis government. I know that to be true, some of them know it to be true, and watching the ease, the rapidity and the regularity of that access was for me a real education in the fall and winter of 1985-86.

I am going to be very interested to see, for example, as the New Democratic Party moves forward to give effect in real terms to its tax policy, how it is going to be able to do that with an eye to the poor and the downtrod-

den particularly. I was particularly pleased yesterday to see in the announcement of the Treasurer that the tax reduction program was going to be enriched to target more assistance for that group of Ontario residents.

I will be watching very carefully over the next four to six months, and particularly around budget time next spring, how this party in government makes some of those calls, because some of their best friends are among the most powerful and the most well-off in the community, and I have a sense, if my experience is any guide, that they are going to resist in a very strong and vigorous way some of the claims for fairness and equity. When one starts into tax policy, one very quickly discovers where the rubber meets the road and where rhetoric leaves reality.

1740

As I look to this particular initiative, some of the concerns I have are already indicated. What will happen in new budgetary policy to make up for the \$500 million of forgone revenue? I repeat, not an issue for most people here, but it will be a central issue in the budget-making plans of the government and particularly the policy and priorities committee and most especially for the Treasurer himself. What happens to the policy incorporated in this legislation when we get, as I am absolutely certain we will, a value-added-tax included GST. I think it is probably back to the drawing board.

What about collection? I know my friend the member for Oxford and others opposite, like my colleagues and members of the third party, are genuine in their concern about what it is going to mean for the collecting retail vendors across the province. I suspect that this policy is going to cause, in Sparta and in Thamesville and a lot of other places across Ontario, a big headache for a lot of people who will support in principle the notion that there should be no piggybacking, but they are going to be forced into a collecting mode they have never experienced before and which is going to drive them to absolute frustration and distraction.

My guess, and again it is purely a guess at this point, is that because of that some very interesting market dynamics will occur. We all know, because experience in these kinds of VAT taxes suggests it, that collection becomes a very major issue. My guess is that the market out there will be very dynamic, and vendors who have to collect this are going to respond. They are going to respond in an understandable and realistic fashion. It will be very interesting to hear from the Minister of Revenue, not next year but about a year and half or two years from now, how projected revenues on the retail sales tax account are moving. If there is some leakage, I will not be surprised, because the experience in other jurisdictions with this kind of parallel tracking is very suggestive.

I simply want to conclude by observing that we have a very interesting piece of legislation, one that is consistent with what our friends offered during the campaign, but a campaign where not much was said about the \$500 million of revenue that would be forgone. They are not Social Credit, so they are going to make that up. I am going to be very interested to see how the Treasurer makes that up, and I suspect there are going to be some people over there, not

on the back benches but on the Treasury bench—oh, it is going to hurt. It is going to hurt in ways they cannot yet imagine, and a campaign will be a long piece away and nobody will much notice. Most people, probably, will not even care.

But I am going to be interested, just because I am interested in those kinds of things. I will look very carefully next year to see the impact on the budget-making policy of the new government of the loss of the \$500 million of traditional revenue, particularly when that gets married with what I suspect will be a certainty, very significant losses on the income tax and retail sales tax side that will be occasioned entirely by the recession. That is what recessions are. So a year from now I will expect to see the Treasurer with nary a grey hair left on his head, because he will have to do some things that he is really not going to want to have to do, and he is going to have to do them to some of his colleagues, who are not going to like to have to deliver the message. That is a consequence of this initiative, and it was certainly not one that was widely advertised in the campaign.

I repeat: My sense is that once people start to pay the GST on everything from funeral services to books and antiques and a whole host of other things that we have not ever imagined as taxable in this province, we are going to get a tax revolt. And it will not be led by the member for York South; it will not be led by any of us. I suspect most of us will be, in the first instance, just running for cover, because I think what the GST tax revolt is going to do more than anything else is really focus attention on where the money goes. I could be wrong, because I am only one person and I am listening to what people are saying in my own constituency.

After 15 years and some months, I am finding more and more interest in how it is we spend taxpayers' money. The interest in my community in how politicians spend money on themselves has reached an Olympian height. I know some of the members know that on this subject I have very old-fashioned views, but I would certainly counsel all members, new and old, to some Presbyterian rigour when it comes to the next few years, because this tax is really going to put all politicians under a very sharp focus.

We had better adjust our sails to that wind. I, for one, intend to the best of my ability to represent my constituents who feel that they are taxed too much. They have just about had it and they are going to be assessing a lot of very careful scrutiny on all politicians in the coming months and years as to just how the taxes are collected, who is paying and what the money is going to support.

Mr Daigeler: I would like to stress a few points the member for Renfrew North made, I think with great true reason. As I said earlier, the fact is that the government has chosen, and certainly it is free to do so, to forgo \$500 million of revenue—and, I may indicate, of revenue every year; this is not just a one-shot deal. Every year, they have chosen to forgo \$500 million.

It sounds great and very generous and benevolent. To the people, of course, they are the guys who are not taxing on top of tax. The hard reality, however—and I think the member for Renfrew North has clearly indicated that—is

that somebody has to make up for that shortfall. If anybody who is watching us today thinks this \$500 million is not going to come from somewhere else, he is sadly mistaken.

I am sure that very soon we will see that void being filled by tax increases. The Treasurer, in fairness to him, has already indicated the areas he wants to increase taxes on. But I think for the government to say, "Well, we are so great, we are benevolent, we are generous, we are not charging you \$500 million," is very misleading, because there are so many groups out there which need funding. We know the hospitals, we know the need in the social assistance system, we know the need of the colleges and universities, and the money has to be found.

So if anybody thinks we are at this point getting \$500 million, I think they are sadly mistaken. What the government is giving us with one hand here, it will be taking with the other one. People can certainly count on that.

1750

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I too, like the member for Renfrew North and the member for Nepean, will be watching very closely. As the members know, the way in which this tax will be administered is that every single person in this province will be getting the tax break that is so great, that we have heard about today, which I humbly think is a very small step, but it will be the programs where the need is the greatest that we will be watching to make sure that the needs of this province are met, that the \$500 million is not just part of a slush fund, that the \$500 million will be missed. Let us hope that it will not be missed by the people who need it the most.

The member for Renfrew North also spoke about the complexities and the problems that cannot even be anticipated by the vendors and retailers of this province. Double remittance, double collection—some of them hardly know what those words mean. I beg again for more training, for more communication with these people.

The consumers are another case in point. They really do not know what is going to happen in Ontario on 1 January 1991. I beg and implore that this government communicate with both consumers and retailers about what Bill 1 means and about what the GST means to the ratepayers and taxpayers of this province.

Mr Hope: I am having a hard time understanding. As we notice, the 7% is only a negotiated calculation. They started off with 9%. As most of us are well aware, the 7% is going to escalate because the commitment of the federal government is to keep going until it gets the debt paid. What I am hearing from the opposition, especially from the Liberal side of it, is that they are talking about putting their tax as their proposal on top of the GST. That means as the GST escalates, what are we going to do to compensate the people of low and middle income?

That is the question I am really having a hard time trying to understand: what is really going on, what the philosophy is behind it. Running parallel just alleviates that. If the federal government wants to make a whole bunch of errors, why should we follow in the errors of the

federal government? What I am really puzzled about is where they are coming from with it.

Mr Ruprecht: The member for Renfrew North made a good point in his remarks. In fact, it was reiterated by some members of the government that the new tax imposition, the GST, is going to be so complicated that it will take hour after hour to figure it out. It will consequently add to the burden of small business and in fact to the burden of everyone concerned.

What will happen consequently is that the bankruptcy rate is not going to increase just because of the GST, but the expense that I want to talk about will be added by tax lawyers and accountants, compounding the problems that will exist just by simply collecting it.

Finally, the residents of Ontario are really favoured by an exceptional lifestyle. We are the number one destination across the globe for people who want to emigrate. They look to Ontario for emigrating to and settling down in. When this GST pops in, the fundamental changes of this lifestyle will be radically altered to the point where we may no longer enjoy our lifestyle. I fail to see, even though we might have to support this legislation, how this Bill 1 is going to mitigate this problem to the point where it is going to help a great deal. As some members said, it might help a little bit, but not enough to affect the kind of lifestyle that we have grown used to.

I would expect that members of the government again would stand up and do more. They should talk to their Premier and try to ask him to do more to stop this GST.

Mr Conway: I particularly want to thank my friend the member for Chatham-Kent for his point. I guess I just want to reiterate that from my point of view, the interesting ingredients of this policy are the following.

In making it, the government has abandoned \$500 million worth of traditional revenue for a good cause, in its view. I am not disputing that. I am simply making the point that the finance minister must make that up if he is not just going to add it on to the deficit. I do not imagine he is going to tack all of that on to the deficit, although he might. I do not think that was very well understood by a lot of members inside or outside the place, to be perfectly frank. I know I had some difficulty understanding the impact of the GST replacing the manufacturers' wholesale tax, which has always been taxed by the provincial sales tax.

The point I want to make is that in the policy that Bill 1 incorporates, the government of Ontario has forgone \$500 million worth of revenue. I respect my friends opposite. I know that they are not Social Crediters. I expect that they are going to operate on a calculus other than Major Douglas's $A+B=C$, and I assume that the member for Nickel Belt is going to have to deal with that \$500-million loss.

Second, I expect that in short order we are going to have a value-added-tax-included GST, which I think renders this policy a nullity, but I might be wrong. It is a very, very technical question, but I cannot imagine that if it is VAT-included, the policy of Bill 1 can in fact be made to work.

Third, I make the point that it is going to be one grand headache for small business out there, most of which will in principle accept the argument of Bill 1, but will not like in any way, shape or form the reality of their day-to-day life, which is having to collect it on this parallel track.

Mr Christopherson: I take great pride in standing and speaking in support of Bill 1. As I said in my first speech, I felt very proud that Bill 1 was the first legislative action we took. In listening to the debate today from my honourable friends on the other side of the House, I have not changed that opinion one bit.

I was very interested to listen to the comments of the previous speaker, the member for Renfrew North. I have a great deal of respect for this member, for his intelligence, his sensitivities, his speaking abilities and also the fact that on balance he seems to be a very reasonable individual, which in this House can sometimes be a bit of a scarcity among some of the opposition members.

I was very interested to listen to his concerns about the fact that we had abandoned \$500 million in tax revenue. As the member for Burlington South said earlier in an interjection, it is interesting to note that it was the opposition party that in a panic towards the end of the election

was prepared to forfeit all the revenue from a slash of 1% in the sales tax without any regard for the ramifications and what that might have meant.

I think we understand very well the implications of \$500 million in lost revenue. What makes the difference between this government and previous governments is our commitment to the word "fair." When we talk fair taxation, that is not a word we are throwing around lightly.

According to the latest statistics available—which by the way are in *An Agenda for People*, which the opposition seems to love to quote from so much—it is worth noting that in 1984, the most recent stats available, the wealthiest 10% of the population in Canada had 51% of the total net wealth, while the bottom 50% had only 5.7% of the total net wealth. When we talk about fair taxation, we are talking about this kind of situation that Canadians and Ontarians are no longer going to stand for. This government is committed to doing what it can to change this, and we will do it by making the tax system fair.

On motion by Mr Christopherson, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1800.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, Chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

CONTENTS

Wednesday 5 December 1990

Members' statements

Coupures budgétaires à Radio-Canada	2403
Mr Grandmaître	
Waste disposal	2403
Mr B. Murdoch	
High school students	2403
Mr White	
Canadian Broadcasting Corp cutbacks	2403
Mrs McLeod	
Kerri Morrow	2404
Mr Turnbull	
Robert McDonald	2404
Mr Drainville	
Canadian Broadcasting Corp cutbacks	2404
Mr Mahoney	
Toronto waterfront	2404
Mrs Marland	
Construction industry	2405
Mr Perruzza	

Statements by the ministry

Child and family support	2405
Mr Hampton	
Manitoulin land claim settlement	2405
Mr Wildman	
Municipal elections	2406
Mr Cooke	

Responses

Child and family support	2407
Mr Sorbara	
Manitoulin land claim settlement	2407
Mr Scott	
Municipal elections	2407
Mr Mahoney	
Child and family support	2408
Mr Harnick	
Manitoulin land claim settlement	2408
Mr Harnick	
Municipal elections	2408
Mr B. Murdoch	

Oral questions

Economic policy	2408
Mr Conway	
Mr Rae	
Mr Brown	
Goods and services tax	2409
Mrs Y. O'Neill	
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Mr Mahoney	

Rent review	2410
Mr Tilson	
Mr Cooke	
Tuition fees	2411
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Allen	
Developmentally disabled	2411
Mrs McLeod	
Mrs Akande	
Economic policy	2412
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Laughren	
Violence against women	2413
Mr Malkowski	
Ms Swarbrick	
Rouge Valley	2413
Mr Curling	
Mr Wildman	
Mr Cousens	
Waste management	2414
Mr Cousens	
Mrs Grier	
Canadian Broadcasting Corp cutbacks	2414
Mr Dadamo	
Mr Marchese	
Gasoline prices	2415
Mr McGuinty	
Mrs Carter	
Mr Ramsay	
Northern development	2415
Mr Eves	
Miss Martel	
Tourism industry	2416
Mr Drainville	
Mr North	
French-language radio services	2416
Mr Grandmaître	
Mr Marchese	

Petitions

Air and water quality	2417
Mr Carr	
Fanshawe Pioneer Village	2417
Mrs Mathysen	

Report by committee

Standing committee on regulations and private bills	2417
Mr Sutherland	
Agreed to	2417

First readings		Mr Stockwell	2421
		Mr Mammoliti	2423
		Mr Drainville	2423
		Mr Daigeler	2424
		Mr Mahoney	2424
		Mr Perruzza	2425
		Mr McClelland	2425
		Mr B. Ward	2429
		Mr Sutherland	2430
		Mr Ruprecht	2431
		Mr White	2432
		Mr Conway	2432
		Mr Christopherson	2437
		Adjourned	2437
		Other business	
		Advertising by members	2408
		Mr Mahoney	
		City of Vanier Act	2417
		The Speaker	
		Adjournment	2437
		Lists of members	
		Members and their responsibilities	2438
Second readings			
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 1	2418		
Ms Wark-Martyn	2418		
Mrs Y. O'Neill	2418		
Mr Hope	2420		
Mrs Sullivan	2421		
Employment Standards Amendment Act (Pregnancy and Parental Leave), 1990, Bill 14	2417		
Mr Mackenzie			
Agreed to	2417		
Manitoulin, Barrie and Cockburn Islands Act, 1990, Bill 15	2417		
Mr Wildman			
Agreed to	2417		
Municipal Elections Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 16	2418		
Mr Cooke			
Agreed to	2418		
Child and Family Support Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 17	2418		
Mr Hampton			
Agreed to	2418		

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 5 décembre 1990

Déclaration d'un député		Première lecture	
Coupures budgétaires à Radio-Canada	2403	Loi de 1990 modifiant les lois relatives aux obligations alimentaires	2418
M. Grandmaitre		M. Hampton	
		Adoptée	2418



66 1990

66 1990

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 6 December 1990

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 6 décembre 1990



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volumes reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auraient quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 6 December 1990

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

ALCOHOL ABUSE

Mr McClelland: Members of the Legislature are aware that alcohol is a drug and that it can be lethal. We have all heard and read in the news about the tragic death of young Jimmy Whiffen, a grade 9 student who had the equivalent of a 26-ounce bottle of alcohol in his system at the time of his death.

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has stated that he will meet with Liquor Licence Board of Ontario officials to consider the jury's recommendations. Though we are pleased to see that an initiative has been taken in this regard, we urge prompt attention to greater awareness and education initiatives.

We believe that the minister should act immediately to implement warning labels such as those currently mandatory in the United States. Clearly, research has been done in this area to warrant the use of warning labels as an effective way to educate people about the potential hazards of excess drinking. As the minister has stated, this could be put into effect without a great deal of difficulty, so we urge the minister to do so quickly in the hope that we may be able to delay another tragic death.

As I am sure all members are aware, some distilleries and breweries have implemented advertisements promoting responsible drinking. We would encourage all distillers to take up the responsibility of promoting responsible drinking habits.

As the coroner's inquest recommended, the government should look to amending the existing Liquor Licence Act to impose stiffer penalties on those who supply alcohol to minors. We would also encourage the Attorney General to meet with his colleagues and the Minister of Justice to consider criminalization.

In closing, I am sure the government will make these recommendations a subject of further discussion, and we hope it can get started and implement them quickly. Let's get started now.

COUPURES BUDGÉTAIRES À RADIO-CANADA

M. Villeneuve : L'annonce de la Société Radio-Canada de ses coupures budgétaires pour la programmation française ici à Toronto prive de nombreux téléspectateurs francophones de leur seule source d'information aux affaires publiques et aux événements politiques ici en Ontario.

La programmation d'Ottawa et de Montréal ne pourra jamais compenser cette perte. Quoique l'on dise, si ces compressions budgétaires étaient justifiées ou même si toutes les compressions budgétaires étaient justifiées, il ne demeure pas moins qu'elles ont été faites et que la

diffusion de la politique provinciale de l'Ontario en souffrira énormément.

Bien que la continuité de la programmation par la privatisation soit la meilleure solution, je ne crois pas que ce soit possible en ce moment. La seule façon de laquelle une diffusion provinciale suffisante peut être restituée est que le réseau de la chaîne française de TVOntario prenne en main les programmes auparavant diffusés par CBLFT de Toronto.

J'exige au ministre de la Culture et des Communications de diriger la chaîne française de TVOntario vers la relève des programmes que la population d'expression française a perdus, et d'assurer que la Chaîne française puisse accomplir le même degré de reportage partout dans la province tel que réalisé auparavant par CBLFT de Toronto.

MARGUERITE D'YOUVILLE

Mr Martin: I am honoured today to be able to stand in the House and pay tribute to a Canadian woman who will be recognized on a worldwide scale on 9 December as the first Canadian-born saint.

It is significant, I think, that I stand on a day when we focus so sharply on women's issues in response to the tragic events of Montreal of last year. Marguerite d'Youville was a woman married and then widowed, a single mother who established a community of women to set up hospitals in the Montreal area. She was born in 1701 and died in 1771.

In Sault Ste Marie, we have a hospital established by the Grey Nuns, which is the order she established. She was a wife, a mother, founder of a community of religious women, a social activist, an administrator, a person of prayer and, of course, a miracle worker.

Today we in the New Democratic Party who espouse these same principles and work towards the same ends as Marguerite are greatly honoured to recognize her and give her the respect due on this important date in the life of her community.

SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION

Mr Beer: As everyone is aware, the greater Toronto area is growing at a very rapid rate. In 1989 the school boards representing York, Durham, Peel and Halton regions asked the then Liberal government to introduce special measures to provide additional financial support for school construction.

The government then brought in a bill to permit school boards to set out a lot levy for education purposes on all new housing developments. After debate in this House, the bill became law and school boards may now develop a lot levy bylaw which, once approved by the Ministry of Education, can then be put in place.

The York region public school board and the York region Roman Catholic separate school board have

developed a common bylaw and are ready to implement it, but they are still awaiting approval from the ministry.

In the fall of 1989, the York region separate school board had over 350 portables and the public board over 650 portables. Today, the two boards combined have over 1,000 portables. Clearly, new schools and additions are needed. The York region public board estimates that it needs one high school and six elementary schools a year to keep pace with growth. The separate board is in a similar situation.

The fast-growth boards need help. The previous Legislature voted to give them the extra help they asked for. Those of us living in York region asked the minister to expedite the approval of the two York region boards' bylaw so we can get kids out of portables and into real schools.

1340

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

Mr Sterling: Later this afternoon I will introduce a private member's bill entitled An Act to amend the Professional Engineers Act. As the only professional engineer sitting in this Legislature, I want to make certain the public is aware that the Association of Professional Engineers of the Province of Ontario has through its actions, particularly over the past year, indicated that it will not tolerate sexism within the engineering profession.

Under subsection 14(2) of the present act, the registrar of the association can refuse a licence to an applicant where the past conduct of the individual affords grounds for the belief that the applicant will not engage in the practice of engineering in accordance with the law and with honesty and integrity. However, it is not clear that the registrar could refuse an applicant if his actions exhibited sexism.

This act will give the registrar, without question, the discretion to refuse a licence to an applicant who had been convicted of sexual assault or aggravated sexual assault under the Criminal Code or if there are reasonable and probable grounds that the applicant has harassed another person because of the sex of that person.

Ninety-seven per cent of the professional engineers of Ontario are male. As a result of the past attitudes and the tragedy of last 6 December, I do not believe that giving these added powers to those who are responsible for licensing our engineers is unreasonable.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORP CUTBACKS

Mr Malkowski: Last night I was watching CBC's The Journal and, having taken a look at the newspapers, I was certainly very moved by the stories I have heard from people who have worked at CBC, the loss of jobs that are affecting people in Ontario and the disastrous effect that has on family life, the cultural aspects of Canada that will be lost.

If we look at cities such as Windsor, I do not know why we are not seeing the Conservative government change the map of Canada and have Windsor become part of Michigan. We are seeing a lack of cultural information.

We are going to see an effect on the lives of people and their families because of this loss of jobs.

If, as we have heard, it might be possible there will be a cut in the broadcast of the House of Commons which would mean that we will not have the interpreter who has made this broadcast accessible also to deaf Canadians, I do not know what will happen to the deaf community, which includes people such as myself. What will we do if we do not have these types of programs accessible to us?

This has shown that there is no sensitivity by the Canadian government in relation to the culture of this country. I think that what we are seeing with the cut to CBLFT is obviously a lack of sensitivity to the French-speaking people in this country. I think that what CBC has now become is the Conservative Broadcast Catastrophe.

RENT REVIEW

Ms Poole: I would like to bring to the attention of the House the concerns of the Bretton Place Tenants' Association. The president of the tenants' association is concerned that the government's proposed rent control legislation has no provision for major repairs and capital improvements. In the case of Bretton Place, the tenants and owners agreed on which major repairs were necessary—things such as plumbing, a new roof, drywalling and recarpeting. The owners also kept to an agreement that the rent increase would be under 10%.

At the very least, we would have expected that the Minister of Housing, in his legislation, would provide an option for tenants who want work done on their buildings. We agree that 195% rent increases are unacceptable; they are reprehensible and must be stopped. We also agree that the tenants should not be forced to carry the burden of luxury renovations. But while we agree with the intent of the legislation of the Minister of Housing, where we diverge is on how we should accomplish that goal.

The minister may say this is only interim legislation, but surely even interim legislation must be both effective and fair. If the price we have to pay is the erosion of our housing stock, in the final analysis it will be the tenants who are the losers.

The minister must address the capital repair problem in the interim legislation and ensure that what tenants gain today in affordable rents will not be lost tomorrow in the deterioration of their buildings.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr Sterling: Yesterday, our leader was in Kitchener-Waterloo to discuss the effects of the recession and the current provincial government policy on the economic opportunities in that area. Our leader heard at first hand of the hardships facing Kitchener-Waterloo, the same hardships that face nearly every corner of this province today. Community leaders told him that more than 1,700 jobs have been lost in the last year through consolidation or company movement to the United States.

There is a profound uncertainty in this province over what action, if any, this government plans to take to promote job creation and economic opportunity in this province. There is uncertainty over how the government

perceives the employers of Ontario, whether it sees them as creators of jobs, of economic stability and the engine that will lift this province out of the recession or as a cash cow, a bottomless pit of tax revenue.

This government must send a clear message, a message that says jobs count, people count and the communities of this province are not being left to wither away as political ideology is placed before common business sense.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRCHALL-BENWELL AFFAIR

Mr Sutherland: I rise to make a statement today in appreciation of the work done by the Princeton Historical Society and the Oxford Historical Society on their celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Birchall-Benwell affair.

The Birchall-Benwell affair has strong historical significance, not only for the county of Oxford but also for the province of Ontario. As a little background to that, Reginald Birchall was the son of an English nobleman who came to Canada on a program to enhance and develop farming in Ontario. As part of that, he was able to entice Frederick C. Benwell to come to Oxford as well and to entice Frederick Benwell's father to give money to Mr Birchall. However, Mr Birchall was not one of most honest means and it ended up that Mr Benwell was found in the Blenheim swamp in Oxford county.

The trial that occurred afterwards had great significance, was covered all over England because it included English nobility as well and is most noted for the fact that it was one of the first times forensic science was used in a trial in Ontario and also the first time meteorological conditions were used as evidence.

I want to congratulate the Princeton Historical Society and the Oxford Historical Society for commemorating this significant event in Ontario's history.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Hon Mrs Boyd: I wish to inform members about this government's policy on education about religion in public schools, an issue that has preoccupied parents, educators and legislators in this province for a very long time.

The policy I am announcing today will permit education about religion in Ontario public schools that is not indoctrinational. I am also pleased to release the Report on Religious Education in Ontario Public Elementary Schools, which was submitted to the previous minister by Dr Glenn A. Watson.

I would like now to inform members of some of the events which led up to the development of the policy I am announcing today. On 30 January 1990 the Ontario Court of Appeal found that subsection 28(4) of Ontario regulation 262 was inconsistent with the freedom of conscience and religion guaranteed by section 2(a) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The court made it clear that the regulation was invalid because it permitted the teaching of a single religious tradition as if it were the exclusive means of developing moral thinking and behaviour. The court also stated that programs designed to

teach about religion and to foster moral values—without indoctrination in a particular religious faith—would not contravene the charter. An interim policy on this matter has been in effect since 28 February 1990.

The policy I am announcing today is in keeping with the interim policy and will permit boards of education to offer programs of education about religion in grades 1 to 8 during the school day for up to 60 minutes per week. Local communities will have the right to decide through their local school boards whether or not such programs are desired in their schools and parents may choose not to enrol their children in any program so offered by a board.

1350

Our policy is to promote the widest possible choices for communities and for families with respect to education about religion. The purpose of these programs is educational; they must not indoctrinate in or give primacy to any particular religious faith.

The court offered eight tests to distinguish between religious indoctrination and education about religion. These tests were outlined in the interim policy, and boards opting to offer programs of education about religion must ensure that programs delivered in their schools meet the court standards.

In order to assist boards in implementing this new policy, my ministry will develop a resource document on programs of education about religion for grades 1 to 8. This document will be developed in both English and French. A draft copy will be circulated to educators and other interested groups for comment within 18 months.

In addition, school boards can continue to provide space in school buildings, as they do for various community-related activities, for indoctrinational religious classes before the opening or after the close of the instructional program of the schoolday.

However, the charter requires equality of treatment, and boards that exercise this option must make space available to religious groups on an equitable basis.

As members know, the Court of Appeal ruled on religious education in public elementary schools. While section 29 of regulation 262, which governs religious education in public secondary schools, was not before the court, it is the opinion of legal counsel to the government that this section promotes religious indoctrination and is therefore inappropriate.

Consequently, both section 28 and section 29 will be revoked and amended to reflect the permanent policy which will become effective 1 January 1991.

Members may be aware that secondary schools currently offer an optional credit course in world religions at the grade 11 and 12 levels. The amended regulation will permit boards to continue to offer this course.

I wish to state that the policy on education about religion I have outlined does not affect schools operated by the Roman Catholic separate school boards, which are guaranteed under section 92 of the Constitution.

At this time, I would like to turn to the Watson report. Dr Watson was asked to recommend curriculum options for an appropriate religious education policy for public elementary schools. His recommendations were made

without benefit of the court decision, which was announced just one day before Dr Watson submitted his report.

While Dr Watson recognized the necessity of a multi-faith approach to education about religion, one of his major recommendations is at variance with the court decision. Legal counsel to the government points out that to devote between one third and two thirds of a program to the study of one particular religion, as suggested by Dr Watson, would give primacy to that faith and would contravene the charter as interpreted by the Court of Appeal.

I believe that the policy I am announcing today can be seen within the context of the long-established vision of the public elementary and secondary schools as open and accessible to all on an equal basis.

Public schools are places where students of diverse backgrounds can grow together. It is our intent that programs of education about religion enable students of all faiths to learn about one another and to enjoy the richness of our collective and individual heritage.

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, if I might before I begin, I would ask the permission of the House to continue with the statements and the responses and then move to a request for unanimous consent for a special statement.

The Speaker: Agreed?

Agreed to.

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT DÉVELOPPEMENT DU NORD

Hon Miss Martel: Two days ago my colleague the Treasurer announced in this House that \$41 million worth of government renovation and maintenance projects would be made public very soon. These projects are part of the government's commitment of \$700 million in capital works projects to fight the recession. They have been fast-tracked so that the government can provide needed jobs as quickly as possible.

As the Minister of Northern Development, I am pleased to confirm today that half of those projects will go to the hard-hit communities in northern Ontario. The decision to spend \$20 million of the \$41 million worth of fast-track proposals in the north demonstrates clearly this government's strong commitment to northerners.

Developing these northern projects has been a co-operative effort by a number of ministries, including Natural Resources, Transportation, Colleges and Universities, Culture and Communications, the Office for Disabled Persons and Tourism and Recreation. I want to thank my fellow cabinet members for recognizing the needs of northern Ontario, especially at this time.

The list of these initiatives includes:

The Ministry of Natural Resources will be undertaking almost 200 projects, mainly forestry-related, throughout the north.

The Ministry of Transportation will be upgrading driver and vehicle centres, rehabilitating municipal airports and doing highway-related work.

The Ministry of Culture and Communications will have telephone and cable projects in 24 communities.

The Ministry of Colleges and Universities will renovate Commerce Court in North Bay.

The Office for Disabled Persons will be making a number of facilities more accessible to people with disabilities.

The Ministry of Tourism and Recreation will make improvements to Old Fort William near Thunder Bay.

All of these projects, which have been selected for the north, are designed with the northern climate in mind. Winter conditions will not hold up our plans.

I want to emphasize that these fast-tracked projects are only the beginning. Our government is currently reviewing more than 3,000 projects that will form the basis for our \$700-million, recession-fighting capital works program. I hope to follow this good news for the north with more of the same.

Further, as the Premier indicated on Tuesday in question period, this government is looking at other measures to deal with the economic problems facing us in northern Ontario.

Le Nord de l'Ontario est durement touché par la récession. Les politiques du gouvernement fédéral, comme par exemple les taux d'intérêt élevés, la valeur élevée du dollar, l'imposition d'une taxe de 15 % sur le bois d'oeuvre exporté aux États-Unis et l'accord de libre-échange ne font qu'aggraver les problèmes existants.

De plus, la taxe sur les produits et services proposée aura elle aussi des retombées négatives, comme l'indique un rapport interprovincial que j'ai rendu public lundi dernier, intitulé «Rapport sur les inquiétudes concernant les répercussions des récentes mesures fiscales sur les économies du Nord».

We want to do what we can for those people who are being hurt by these federal policies. We want to do it as soon as possible. That is our immediate goal. Our long-term goal is to keep building, in big ways and small, the economy of this province, in spite of the recession and federal policies. We will quietly but steadily lay the foundation for a strong recovery in the north and across the province.

These initiatives will stimulate local economies in which projects are undertaken by creating much-needed jobs and encouraging the purchase of goods and services from those communities.

These funds will also help address the problem of inadequate financing of public infrastructure. Our government inherited this problem and we hope to deal with it in a positive way. This funding is one step towards resolving the problem.

These worthwhile projects will have a positive impact on northern Ontario over the coming months. Again, they are but a first step. They do, however, reflect this government's commitment to the many people who inhabit the largest geographical area in Ontario.

RESPONSES

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr Brown: I am pleased to rise today to respond to the statement by the Minister of Northern Development. As the minister well knows, we have unparalleled

unemployment in certain areas of the north. It is not homogeneous. Some areas are not doing badly; others are doing very, very badly. They are in fact in depression, whether the cause is mining layoffs, whether the cause is a lack of exploration or whether the cause is a loss of forest-related jobs.

We appreciate today that the minister has reacted to what we have said and moved forward with these initiatives. I find it rather interesting that this is the third time this week the minister has made the same announcement. We really think, though, that it is inadequate. We are looking for some dent in the 3,000 lost jobs in the forest industry. We are looking for some dent in the 4,000 to 5,000 layoffs in the mining industry. We are looking for some dent.

We want to know how the government chooses where these projects go. We want to know if they go to the areas that need them the most. We want to know what the government's criteria are. We want to know those things and we want the minister and the ministry to show some leadership, to show us some of their ideas, to tell us where the \$200-million economic development fund is and to tell us where the hundreds of millions of dollars of roadwork that the government promised in the famous Agenda for People is. We want to know these things. While this is nice, it is just that: nice.

1400

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Mr Beer: I want to respond to the statement made by the Minister of Education. I would say that we recognize that, given the charter and given the court's decision, following the interim policy that was set out by the previous government, it is in accordance with the advice we had at that time, and I am not surprised that advice has remained the same.

I think the decision as well that this must also deal with the secondary level follows from that. There is no point in getting into a series of court cases where clearly, the court having spoken with respect to the elementary level and knowing the interpretation of the charter, this is the route that would have to be followed.

We are also pleased today to see that the report by Dr Watson has been released and we look forward to looking at that particular report in terms of some of the other recommendations that are made there.

The point I would like to raise with the minister in a sense is not so much what is in here, but to recognize, as I think all of us do, that there are other parents and other families in Ontario who seek very genuinely to have some greater recognition of their religion within the educational system.

I think it is fair to say that neither we nor the Conservatives have been able to come to grips with the question of how we can relate religion in a more specific sense to the educational programs that we have in this province. Clearly, we have to have an acceptance of tolerance and, within the public system, we cannot be giving a priority to one system or another.

But we also recognize that, for historical and constitutional reasons, we have developed one system, or part of a system, in terms of the separate school system, which has permitted a particular group within our society to have religious education in the schools.

I know the minister is going to be meeting with a number of groups on this specific issue. Those of us in the opposition are meeting as well. The minister spoke the other day about perhaps an advisory committee or some mechanism where I think we can give expression to those people for whom the statement today will not really respond to their needs.

I do not think any of us has a nice, neat, simple answer to how we can more easily include them within the broader educational framework, but with our emphasis—I think it is the government's and that of the opposition—on really looking at what parents would like to see within the school system, the kind of ethical and moral values they would like to see as part of the total program, I do believe that we owe it to those other people in our society to sit down and try to see if there is some way we can more adequately meet their needs.

But in terms of the statement made today by the minister, I believe, as I say, that it flows from the actions of the previous government and we support them.

Mrs Cunningham: I would like to take the opportunity to respond to the Minister of Education's statement on religious education and let her know that I think the various school boards across the province of Ontario will be most pleased with the document before us today.

Those school boards individually, I think, and as groups submitted their concerns to Dr Watson, and their concerns were that school boards be given the option to provide religious education and that knowledge about religion through the provision of opening exercises and religious education has an appropriate and beneficial function in Ontario's public schools.

They added that individual school boards and their communities must work out for themselves whether or not religious education is appropriate and how it should be implemented. I think their final point was to make young people familiar with various views to foster an understanding and appreciation of others and develop genuine tolerance.

I would like to say to the minister, our only concern is the 18 months. As she knows, some boards are already trying to foster this kind of programming. Some have never given it up; some are more silent than others. I would like to encourage the minister to come forth with her document as quickly as possible and ask the boards to respond as quickly as possible. I do not think we want to lose programs that are there, that are working efficiently and that the minister would support.

I would also like to say that with this statement, all of us, I think, in our caucus recognize the needs for support for families these days and always as we talk about morals and values in our homes. We would underline that this is a support to the home, this document, and we thank the minister for her response. We are anxious to see the Wat-

son report, which we have been waiting for for some amount of time.

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr Eves: In response to the statement made today by the Minister of Northern Development, it seems that we must have struck a chord in our questioning yesterday and on previous days with respect to spending money in northern Ontario.

If we are going to have a five-page statement for \$20 million of the \$300 million the Premier promised would be spent during the fiscal year 1990-91 in his Agenda for People, then we are going to get a 70-page statement when the other \$280 million is announced before 20 December. I presume that announcement is forthcoming.

The minister on page 3 refers to the fact that she is reviewing more than 3,000 projects that will form the basis of the capital works program. If she is in fact reviewing those 3,000 projects, could she kindly table those projects so that all members of the Legislature and the public of Ontario can see the 3,000 projects that she has under active consideration at this time.

I just want to remind the minister again that her Premier, her leader, says in his Agenda for People on pages 10 and 11 that this \$300 million will be spent in northern Ontario during the fiscal year 1990-91, which she knows expires on 31 March next, and her Treasurer stood in this House a couple of days ago and said everybody who knew anything knew that we were in recession in April.

I presume the Premier made that commitment on 19 August of this year, knowing what his Treasurer knows, that we are in a recession, and knowing we are in a recession, he still made the commitment to spend the \$300 million by 31 March 1991.

Mr Sterling: I hope we can expect a statement tomorrow from the newly created minister of eastern Ontario—as promised by this government in the past election—about initiatives in an area of the province that needs desperate help. I only hope that this government does not forget about eastern Ontario as the last government did.

The Speaker: A little late now, but the member is out of order obviously. We are responding to statements made, not ones we think will be made.

Hon Miss Martel: If I might, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House for statements to be made with respect to the massacre last year.

The Speaker: Agreed?

Agreed to.

1410

ANNIVERSARY OF SHOOTING IN MONTREAL L'ANNIVERSAIRE DU FUSILLADE À MONTRÉAL

Hon Mr Rae: Geneviève Bergeron, Hélène Colgan, Nathalie Croteau, Barbara Daigneault, Anne-Marie Edward, Maude Haviernick, Barbara Maria Klueznick, Maryse Laganière, Maryse Leclair, Anne-Marie Lemay, Sonia Pelletier, Michèle Richard, Annie St-Arneault and

Annie Turcotte. These are the names of the women who were killed last year in Montreal.

Naturellement, nos premières pensées ne sont pas des pensées politiques ; ce sont des sentiments que nous voulons partager avec les familles de ces jeunes femmes. C'est peut-être un moment important pour nous, en tant que Canadiens, de dire que nous avons tous beaucoup perdu dans l'événement que nous appelons maintenant le massacre de Montréal. Mais il faut avant tout se souvenir et se rappeler que ce sont les familles et les amis de ces jeunes femmes qui d'abord ont perdu tant de choses.

All of us in Canada and around the world were shocked and devastated by the news of the brutal killing of 14 young women in Montreal on 6 December 1989. Since that time, I think we have all had many moments when we have reflected on what took place and its meaning. Our first thoughts are with the families of those who died so tragically and so brutally. No words of ours can possibly assuage the grief and sense of loss of those who lost their loved ones, and I think before we talk of anything else we should think of the families.

But one must also say something else. I know that there has been some controversy over exactly how we should respond and interpret the events, but it is not good enough to say that it was simply a random act of mindless violence because that is not, it seems to me, an adequate reflection on what took place. Women were singled out. Women were separated from men and were brutally shot down.

Shortly after the events, an article appeared in the Globe and Mail that I thought was quite an extraordinary evocation of the emotion that I know is shared by millions of Canadians. It was an article written by Stevie Cameron. I was planning to read it in preparation for these remarks—I read it again yesterday—and I noted with interest that it was reproduced in today's paper. I want to read a couple of paragraphs from it because there are times when all of us grope for words, and I think we are grateful to those who have been able to find ways of expressing what is on all our minds.

She says at the end of the article:

"Now our daughters have been shocked to the core, as we all have, by the violence in Montreal. They hear the women were separated from the men and meticulously slaughtered by a man who blamed feminists for his troubles. They ask themselves why nobody was able to help the terrified women, to somehow stop the hunter as he roamed the engineering building.

"So now our daughters are truly frightened and it makes their mothers furious that they are frightened. They survived all the childhood dangers, they were careful as we trained them to be, they worked hard. Anything was possible and our daughters proved it. And now they are more scared than they were when they were little girls."

It is entirely appropriate that we in this Legislature should take a moment to reflect on the extent of this violence, to pay tribute to these women, to remember them and also to pledge ourselves, as we from time to time abandon our partisan personalities, to simply realize that

violence against women is a horrendous affront, that it is pervasive and that it must be stopped.

Ten years ago when someone in the House of Commons asked a question about wife battering there were titters of laughter around the assembly. I think it fair to say that would not happen anywhere in a Canadian political forum today, but even that is inadequate progress. Far too many examples are before us of women who have been beaten and battered and assaulted and killed. We must again pledge ourselves to see that this stops, that we put the resources and the energies and the efforts of all of us into the attempt to end this violence.

This is what our government has pledged to do. We are building on work that has been done by previous governments, Conservative and Liberal, and now New Democrat. We can surely join together and recognize that what has happened was not simply a random act. It was a tragic and terrible reflection of one of the greatest social problems we face together as a community, and we must do everything we can to see not only that something like this could never happen again but that all examples of prejudice or violence against women are brought to an end.

Mrs Fawcett: On this, the anniversary of the horrific tragedy at l'École Polytechnique, I wish to express our party's very real and deep concern in the aftermath of the Montreal massacre.

The hopes, dreams and ambitions of the 14 young women came to a terrifying end from the senseless actions of the psychotic sociopath, Marc Lépine. Our thoughts and prayers are with all the remaining family members at this time. If any good can come from reflecting on such evil, it comes from the realization that the gender prejudice so graphically illustrated by this insane killer is shared by many in today's society.

Lépine was insane; on this we can all agree. However, the underlying gender discrimination that pushed him to blame all women for his failures and individual conflicts continues, sadly to, permeate and affect the attitudes and actions of our society.

We are often guilty of assigning individual human traits and characteristics to a gender group. For example, aggression and logic are considered masculine characteristics; sensitivity and passivity are thought to be feminine. Anyone outside these restrictive gender parameters runs into discrimination and even castigation.

I wish to remind everyone that the women's movement during this century has fought hard for legislation to battle such inequalities. Women have won the right to vote, have gained acceptance in the workplace and are battling for acceptance in the boardroom. We have even broken the all-male bastion of political representation. Unfortunately, though, we cannot legislate a change in attitudes.

We in government must ensure that our in-House actions do not encourage society to further entrench gender discrimination. In checking our bias at the door, perhaps the public will not pick up on remarks like, "Bring me another tequila, Sheila," or, "We'll have that cute blond guy in the front row walk across the floor." Flippant remarks like these by legislators only serve to justify the demeaning views towards gender groups held by some of the public.

If we allow such gender discrimination to affect the public psyche, hatred through stereotypes and restriction of freedom result. Extreme hatred through prejudice produces violence. Extreme hatred through prejudice channelled by sociopathic psychosis spawns the evil of a Marc Lépine and the horror and tragedy of l'École Polytechnique.

We must provide legislation that disallows discrimination on the basis of gender. It is time that this Parliament embraced the ideal that in a democracy it is wrong to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, colour or gender.

I call upon my colleagues in this House to make that commitment and to lead by example in order that we send a clear and concise message to society, a message that will reinforce that this type of discrimination towards women—in fact, any type of discrimination—is no longer socially acceptable and will not be tolerated.

1420

Mrs Witmer: I would like to join my honourable colleagues from the other two parties in expressing my sympathy to the families of the 14 young women in Montreal who were brutally slaughtered one year ago today. Fourteen young women were killed in a senseless act of violence, 14 young women who were full of promise and idealism.

However, we must remember that this massacre of one year ago was not an isolated incident of violence. Every day in this province women flee violent and abusive situations. As well, the number of sexual assaults reported to crisis centres in Ontario is increasing.

It is not enough today to remember. We must first mourn; then we must begin to work for change. We must all dedicate ourselves to the task of eradicating violence against women. We must act to eliminate those dehumanizing events and the headlines that we see with such sickening regularity.

As a parent, as a mother and as a member of this House, I believe that the best tribute we can pay to the 14 students and the best monument we can build to their memory is to change our society's attitudes about violence against women.

All women must be able to live without fear. We need to educate people in this province. We need to sensitize them to recognize that there are certain attitudes, that there are certain behaviours, no matter how casual or how seemingly innocent, that do contribute to the continuation of violent and abusive behaviour.

We all need to break the silence and we need to stand up and call for an end to violence against women. We need to build a world where people care for and respect each other regardless of our gender, our race or our religion.

As we observe today a moment's silence, let each one of us consider what we personally can do to ensure that this tragedy is never repeated.

The Speaker: With your consent, I invite all members, visitors and guests alike, to stand and bow your heads in a moment of silent reflection.

The House observed one minute's silence.

ADVERTISING BY MEMBERS

Hon Mrs Carter: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Yesterday the member for Mississauga West implied that I had misspent taxpayers' money on an

advertisement that mentioned the name of my party. The Peterborough Examiner yesterday faxed to my riding office a letter that I would like to read to the House:

"Dear Mrs Hicks:

"This will confirm your instruction of October 31, 1990, to place a Remembrance Day announcement in our publication, Kawartha Senior, November 2, 1990, to read in part, 'Jenny Carter, MPP, Peterborough.' Inadvertently, an error appeared in your announcement due to a production error and appeared in print, 'Jenny Carter, NDP, Peterborough.'

"The Peterborough Examiner sincerely regrets any inconvenience or confusion that this may have caused Mrs Carter or our readers."

An advertising representative signed it.

Mr Mahoney: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I referred the matter to you, as a matter of fact. There were two items. One of them was the photograph I presented to you outlining a constituency office sign in Kitchener-Wilmot with the New Democratic Party logo.

I was not looking for a response, although I am delighted to see that it was simply an error and to understand that the minister has recognized that it was an error. However, the taxpayers, I presume, did pay for, initially, and certainly paid for that sign. I expected a report from you, Mr Speaker, with respect, not from—

The Speaker: To the member for Mississauga West, your point of order was taken yesterday. There will be a response to you. The member rose quite properly, as all members are entitled to do as a point of personal explanation.

Interjections.

The Speaker: We have not started question period. Now that we have captured everyone's interest, we can begin oral questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

Mr Nixon: In the gracious speech read to the House by His Honour, he said the "government will soon discuss with the Legislature our suggestions for future action" on the breakdown of Canadian federalism. Shortly after the House began its sessions, I asked the Premier when he would bring forward his proposals. The date was 26 November, and I quote his answer: "Very shortly indeed."

I understand that Mr Parizeau will be in Toronto early next week to speak to an august gathering. I hope many people will be there to hear what he has to say. Surely the Premier would feel that there has been enough delay in this important matter and that the House should be informed, preferably before Mr Parizeau's visit, what action is going to be taken in this House to see what the views of the people of the province of Ontario will be and how this province can take its accustomed position along with the other provinces in looking after our movement towards improving our constitutional arrangements.

Hon Mr Rae: I want to say first of all to the Leader of the Opposition that I am going to be discussing this matter

with him and with the leader of the Conservative Party very shortly.

Mr Elston: Very soon again.

Hon Mr Rae: No, I will say to him next week, if he likes. I hope to be able to make an announcement to the House, certainly before we adjourn. I would make this point to the Leader of the Opposition. I hope he would not suggest that somehow our timetable for discussion of this matter should be affected in any way by when Mr Parizeau happens to be here or anywhere else giving a speech. It does not seem to me that is the criterion one establishes.

We are obviously having discussions within the government, as I think we are entitled to do. We are having discussions within the cabinet, as I think we are entitled to do. I then intend to have a very full discussion with the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party.

I have said to him and I will say to him again that I do not see this as an issue which needs to divide us in a partisan way. I appreciate his concern that we move ahead. I want to move ahead as well and we are going to move ahead. There will be an announcement before we break for Christmas.

1430

Mr Nixon: I think the honourable Premier is aware that Mr Parizeau, as Leader of the Opposition, in conjunction with the Premier of Quebec, has established a commission that is commanding substantial attention in that province and right across the country. It is interesting that a senior cabinet minister in Quebec has been critical of their deliberations since they seem to be so focused on separatism or sovereignty-association. It seems to me that these matters are moving rather rapidly in Quebec and to some extent in Ottawa, where the citizens' forum has been holding some private meetings before it goes out into the country to hear the views on a national basis.

The clock is ticking. There are people in this jurisdiction, and I am sure in this chamber, who are deeply concerned at the momentum sovereignty, if not separatism, is gaining in the province of Quebec. Ontario, and I do not want to put this stronger than it is, has historically had a position of leadership in this regard. I say in response to the Premier's comment that we should not be driven by Mr Parizeau's visit, I would agree with that. I mentioned it only to indicate that the rest of the world is moving and we are simply gazing at our polished spectacles.

Surely it is time that there be a statement from the Premier of some action in this regard. I welcome his comments that he will be meeting with the two opposition leaders. Can he give us any more details as to his views, so that everybody in the House who is deeply concerned about this might get their thinking caps on in some sort of orderly way?

Hon Mr Rae: Perhaps my approach is different in style from some others, I do not know, though I notice that even he has taken to borrowing some phrases which I have used on other occasions in putting the question. I think that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, and it is flattery that I accept from the Leader of the Opposition.

But let me say this quite sincerely. The leadership that the Leader of the Opposition can provide, that the former Attorney General can provide, that other senior members of the previous government can provide, that the leader of the Conservative Party and members of his caucus can provide, if I may say so, the leadership that can be provided on that basis is every bit as important as what we are all going to be doing together in this Legislature.

I do not claim any monopoly of wisdom in this regard. I can assure the member that this is my approach with respect to constitutional issues. I said when I first came here nearly 10 years ago, when I met with the then Premier, Mr Davis, that there were some issues on which I parked my partisan credentials at the door. That was one of them. The question of the Constitution of Canada, the question of the future of the country and the need for Ontario to play a role is one where I see a need for us to build a consensus within the Legislature and to work together. That was my position 10 years ago and that is my position today.

If the Leader of the Opposition thinks this issue is going to be settled in a month or two, or if he thinks it is going to be driven by a headline on a day or two, I do not share that perspective. This issue is one to which we are going to have to take a practical, intelligent, measured approach. That is the way I am going to try to deal with it. I not only look forward to his counsel and advice, I look forward to his participation, because if anybody can play a constructive role in this regard, it is the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Scott: The Premier in, if I may say so, a very aggressive way today, as on 26 November, tries to deflect a concern about the constitutional position of the government by emphasizing that he wants a bipartisan constitutional policy. I am committed to that. Our party and our interim leader are committed to that, as the Premier is. Our problem is that until we get some inkling about what the program or the proposals of the government are, we cannot support them. We do not know where this government stands on this critical constitutional issue, except that it is in favour of Canada and, its second observation, that the confederacy is not working.

This government has been in office two months, with a one-month period before that preparing itself for office, and we have not had any observations about objectives or process from any member of the government. We want to support legitimate government initiatives, but we have to know what those are. It is getting so serious now that the press is saying—and I am sure this is not justified—that the government is divided and cannot act on the question.

The question for the Premier is this: In light of the timetables that have been set by the hearings in Quebec, which will be reporting within months, can he not regard this as a critical issue that must be addressed almost in priority to any other issue if the unity of the country is to survive?

Hon Mr Rae: I respect the views of the member for St George-St David in this particular area, though I must say I was rather surprised that the last time he was asking

questions on this subject he quoted from a document in which his quotations and assertions with respect to that document were not accurate. So I listened very carefully to the member, and he asked what priority it has. I guess that was the question, or is it whether I see this as the number one priority?

I have to say that our ability to provide work, jobs and economic leadership for the people of the province is my first concern. Obviously, as a Canadian and as leader of this province, I share a profound concern with respect to what is taking place in the country, in Quebec in particular but not only that. It is the sense, if I may say so, that the federal government is choosing to see this as a partisan issue. The Prime Minister gave a speech last week in which he said the Conservative Party gave birth to Canada and the Conservative Party is going to be the party that is going to save Canada.

That is the approach I do not want to take. I do not want to take a partisan approach. We are going to be addressing this issue on a non-partisan basis. That is the approach we should take. I think it is the intelligent, measured approach, and I think it is the right approach for us to take.

SOCIAL SERVICES CASE LOAD

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the honourable Minister of Community and Social Services dealing with the explosive growth of case load and the concomitant costs reflected once again in the report in the media today that the case load in Metropolitan Toronto is up 75% year over year. The Treasurer, in his statement earlier in the week, referred to the additional costs somewhat obliquely, but it is a matter of grave concern.

Can the minister, who I understand has been talking with Metro politicians on this matter, report to the House what the expectations are for this year, what additional expenditure will be needed on a province-wide basis? I would like to know, and perhaps the House would as well, what her views are on just what is going on there, as it has become apparent that it is not merely the recession that is causing this explosive growth.

Hon Mrs Akande: Yes, we are very concerned about the growth in the number of social service recipients; we are also very aware of it. The projections we had were that the numbers would be doubled. We have very quickly recognized that there is more than that taking place. We have in fact consulted municipalities other than just the one to which the member has referred about the needs they have and are moving towards looking at measures in which we can support them.

I will remind the member that just last week, was it, or the week before, when we did announce the social assistance increases we did also announce that we would be supporting moving money to the municipalities in order to assist them in providing these funds for the social assistance groups.

Mr Nixon: I made reference to some of the causes, and asked the minister to comment on those, because certainly there has been comment about the continuing refugee situation with people not being granted working

permits and a number of other alternatives. But also I was struck that the Treasurer indicated outside the House that the last budget had underestimated the revenue from personal income tax by an amount that would approach and perhaps surpass \$500 million. So there is some considerable leeway in this matter.

Can the minister indicate what the additional costs are expected to be that will flow through her ministry in support of these programs that are allocated directly through the ministry and also in conjunction with the municipalities?

1440

Hon Mrs Akande: I can indicate to the member, as I have done just previously, that these are things we are looking at and studying and consulting on with the other municipalities. I will say, though, we are concerned that there is additional growth other than just what we would anticipate from the recession and from the fact that many have lost their jobs. We are of course looking at the costs that come to us through other sources and for other reasons, and I will report that information here in this House as soon as I have it.

Mrs McLeod: We are anxious to address a clearly growing problem which has crisis proportions. We are anxious to have the minister identify the causes of the problem so we can talk about solutions and costs.

It is our understanding that in August 1990, staff of the Ministry of Community and Social Services conducted a review with the regional municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto, York, Durham and Waterloo to identify the factors associated with the case load increase. We further understand that the results of that review indicated that people who receive assistance have lower education levels and have had previous employment experience. I think this helps to further confirm the findings of the Social Assistance Review Committee that dispelled the myth that people on welfare do not want to work. Clearly there are barriers to people becoming independent. We hope the minister would agree that one of the first focuses of the SARC report that was implemented, the supports to employment program, is critical in encouraging people to move from dependence to independence.

But that program cannot be successful if the minister's case workers are spending all their time managing case loads in excess of 350, a number that we confirmed today with various area ministry offices. Can the minister tell the House when she will invest the proper resources to her front-line income maintenance staff to enable them to provide the necessary counselling, training and work placements to social assistance recipients?

Hon Mrs Akande: I thank the member for her interest and her concern, which I share. We have already begun discussions and plans to do just that, to look at where that addition to staff may be effected in order to more efficiently and effectively move people off social assistance into skills training programs, into the supports to employment program—those moves and initiatives that will effectively remove them from the social assistance rolls.

NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE FRANCHISE

Mr Sterling: On a question of privilege, Mr Speaker: I would like to congratulate Terrace Investments in obtaining a National Hockey League franchise for Ottawa. Thank God, Ontario will finally have a hockey team in the NHL.

The Speaker: It is certainly a point of some passing interest but not one of privilege.

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mrs Witmer: My question is to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues. Today, all parties have expressed their concern about violence against women. A recent US study found that sons who witnessed their fathers' violence are 10 times as likely to abuse their wives as boys of non-violent parents. Mass murderer Marc Lépine witnessed his father's violence. The minister should be aware of the fact that many young boys who have witnessed violence against their mothers are among the 10,000 children waiting for treatment at children's mental health centres. I would like to ask the minister how we can possibly expect to break this vicious cycle when children do not have access to mental health services in this province.

Hon Ms Swarbrick: That is one of the grave concerns of this government. It is one of the areas being very seriously dealt with and considered in the co-ordinated initiatives against wife assault, which do include attention to the children in those families. I will be pursuing that further in our co-ordinated fashion and with my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services as well.

Mrs Witmer: I would like to be more specific. I would like to share a few case examples with the minister. One three-year-old boy who is waiting for mental health services in Ontario, who has witnessed family violence, now attacks his parents, uses excessive profanity, has violent tantrums and urinates in opposition to parental demands. A 10-year-old boy, who has also witnessed physical abuse at home, is aggressive with his peers and has burned himself. What is this government prepared to do to ensure that these children are not the Mark Lépins of the future?

Hon Ms Swarbrick: We share the member's extremely grave concern. I will refer the question to my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services to see if she would like to add further specifics, as it is concretely her area there.

The Speaker: No, no.

Hon Ms Swarbrick: No?

The Speaker: At the original question you would have had to have referred it to someone else. You must answer if you choose to answer.

Hon Ms Swarbrick: We do share the member's grave concern and we will pursue it and sit down and talk concretely about it.

Mrs Witmer: I appreciate the minister's concerns. However, I would like to share with her today a letter addressed to Dr Peter Lang, who is a child and adolescent

psychiatrist in Kitchener, from the Premier dated 21 May 1990 in his capacity as leader of the official opposition. The Premier stated at that time in response to Dr Lang:

"To have 10,000 children on the waiting list for access to mental health services in Ontario is certainly shameful, and you can rest assured that New Democrats will continue to press this government until it gives our health care system and the health of our children the priority they so rightly deserve."

Although I appreciate the minister's concerns, I would like to know what immediate plans this government has to reduce the waiting list for those 10,000 children who are in desperate need.

Hon Ms Swarbrick: We inherited a number of deficits when we took over this government. That is one we will concretely work on, and I will be pleased to get back to the member as soon as we have got something more specific.

COURT SYSTEM

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Attorney General. Over the past year, the people of this province have been repeatedly shocked and horrified by violent crimes against women. In the past week and a half alone, two men have been charged with particularly brutal crimes against a six-year-old girl. We have seen women brutalized jogging in parks; we have seen them brutalized driving to school.

According to the Ontario women's directorate, one in four women can expect to be sexually assaulted. In 1987 there were over 16,000 reported incidents of spousal assault. Yet this is only the tip of the iceberg. The truly shocking statistic is that, depending on the nature of the crime, up to 90% of victims do not report the crimes to the police. They do not trust the justice system. Now they see 1,500 sexual assault and related offences out the window in our provincial courts. What is the Attorney General prepared to do to help restore faith in the justice system in Ontario?

Hon Mr Hampton: I would like to thank the member for the question because this is indeed an important issue. I want to say first to the member that earlier this week the Chief Justice of Ontario said in a speech that while we have problems in terms of the justice system in Ontario, problems that have been growing over a number of years, by and large we still have a very good justice system in the province and a justice system that is striving to be even better. I would ask the member to remember that.

The member asks specifically what we are doing in the sense of trying to ensure that crimes of violence against women are receiving some priority. I would point out to him the following: First of all, in the midst of those problems that have happened as a result of the recent Supreme Court of Canada decision, crown attorneys across the province are making every effort to ensure that charges of sexual assault, spousal assault or assaults against women should receive priority and that in all cases we should attempt to preserve those charges by bringing them forward in the court schedule as much as possible.

I want to say to the member, however, that he must surely realize that on the day when the Askov decision came down, there were already charges of that kind that were out of date and that, with our best efforts, we cannot save those charges; they were simply out of date on the day that the Askov came down. However, with any other charges, we will try to bring them forward as much as we can. We are trying to create holes within the court schedule that we can bring them forward and try them as soon as possible.

1450

Mr Harnick: A spokesman for Victims of Violence says people are mystified and frustrated by the province's justice system. In fact, it has been called the criminals' justice system. Ontario has no systematic, province-wide program to inform and support victims. Our party has a strong and consistent record of support for victims in this province and on more than one occasion has introduced legislation establishing a victims' bill of rights, which I have recently succeeded in having the standing committee on administration of justice consider.

Since taking office, unlike in his time in opposition, the Attorney General has been disturbingly silent on the issue of victims. He spent \$40 million on our justice system without a single mention of the rights of victims. I ask the Attorney General to justify this.

Hon Mr Hampton: I am somewhat surprised that the member opposite would say that we have not referred at all to the problems of victims. He attended the press conference that was held two weeks ago where I noted that the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board in Ontario not only has been directed to look at its own procedures and its own legislation to determine how victims are being treated and if they are being treated appropriately and how that may be made better, but it has also been instructed to look outside the jurisdiction of Ontario to inquire as to what may be done.

I also want him to note that all crown attorneys across the province, where they feel victims have been prejudiced as a result of the Askov decision, have been directed to make themselves to victims' groups and to individual victims to explain as best they can why the situation has occurred, how serious the Askov problem is and how long it has been there. I have also indicated to victims' groups that I will meet with them personally where they desire to review the situation. I should add that I have met with some victims' groups already and they are appreciative of our efforts. They have indicated that they are willing to co-operate with us and are looking forward to co-operating with us in building a better justice system from here on.

Mr Harnick: Yesterday the Toronto Star reported that the child victim witness support program will be forced to fold by the end of this month if it does not receive \$120,000 in funding from the provincial government. In July, the now Premier issued a letter of support for that program. Now the New Democratic government says it will not be forced into making a quick decision. What kind of message is this government sending to the victims of Ontario?

Hon Mr Hampton: I note that while the member asked the question, he neglected to mention that this is a project which the federal government, the government of Canada, is abandoning and leaving without funds. The federal government creates a pilot project, creates expectations and then walks away from the program as if the victims do not exist and have never existed.

In answer to the member's question, I am very privileged today to say on behalf of the government of Ontario, on behalf of my colleagues the Minister of Community and Social Services and the Solicitor General, that we have found the funding to enable the program to carry on and we will make the official announcement very soon.

POLICE INVESTIGATION

Mr Curling: The former Liberal government had a Police Services Act that created a special investigations unit; it was to investigate serious injuries and death that may have resulted from criminal offences committed by police officers. I am sure the Solicitor General would be aware of the incident that took place last night in which a member of the public, an individual, was shot by a Metro Toronto police officer.

Earlier today my office contacted both the Metro Toronto Police Force and the Ontario Provincial Police regarding the investigation. We were told that the OPP was investigating this case.

Can the Solicitor General please tell the Legislature exactly who is investigating the incident, and if it is not the special investigations unit, why not?

Hon Mr Farnan: The investigation is taking place under the direction of Judge John Osler, who is the head of the special investigations unit. He has requested Detective Inspector Ryder and Detective Inspector Brennan from the OPP criminal investigation branch and they have been assigned to the case. The investigation is very clearly under the leadership and direction of Judge John Osler, the head of the special investigations unit.

Mr Curling: I am sure the Solicitor General is quite familiar with the legislation, but just for the members of the Legislature, let me read a portion of subsection 112(2a) of the act, which provides and states that "persons who are police officers shall not be appointed as investigators."

The minister is aware of this provision, I am sure. Why has he allowed the OPP or the detectives, as he mentioned here, along with the others, to investigate this matter? Is he not aware that the present investigation contravenes the Police Services Act? Will the minister ensure that his ministry complies with his own legislation? Will the minister ensure that independent investigators review this case?

Hon Mr Farnan: The office of the SIU was set up under Judge John Osler. There were advertisements made for investigators to join this branch. There were 2,500 applications. The decision has been made and the director of the SIU is rapidly bringing that up to operational capability.

Nevertheless, there are instances which must be addressed. As the member asking the question will realize, there have probably been some four cases that have been addressed to the SIU at this stage. We are very appreciative

of the good work done by the previous government in bringing forward legislation that set up the SIU. We are using the SIU to the maximum of its potential, and indeed as soon as the investigators are hired, and when they are in place, they will be used. At this particular stage, the director of the SIU has seen fit to invite the OPP to direct this investigation.

1500

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

Mrs Cunningham: I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

We have a shortage of engineers in this province and, more specifically, we have a serious shortage of female engineers. In fact, women make up only 12% of our current engineering enrolment at Ontario universities. Whether we like it or not, there are some very serious barriers to women entering non-traditional occupations in this province. What is the government going to do about this?

Hon Mr Allen: I am happy to address that question. As the member will know, not only the university administrations where there are engineering schools but also the professional bodies themselves have for some time now, and increasingly, been addressing this question. We are encouraging them to extend their work into the secondary school system and abroad to popularize non-traditional occupations for women and in particular those which remain some of the major bastions of male occupation.

With respect to the issue at hand, I would be happy to take it under advisement, and I certainly will be discussing with my ministry further measures in that regard in terms of ways in which we can expedite those existing programs and add to them in the future.

Mrs Cunningham: As usual, the minister and I are on the same wavelength and so we have a partial solution for him today. During the election our leader unveiled the women in science and engineering scholarship fund to encourage women to study science and technology, and today I have tabled that resolution providing a blueprint for the startup of such a fund.

Today, of all days, we need to send a message that we encourage women to enter non-traditional occupations. We want them to know that our government will support them as they break down the barriers on our behalf and on behalf of our sons and daughters as well. Will the minister support this initiative and work with the professional engineering community, which he has already mentioned in his former response? Will the minister work with them in this province to set up what we think is a partial solution, which I believe is this necessary scholarship fund?

Hon Mr Allen: I compliment the member on her initiative. I wish that more members in this House would take that kind of initiative in advancing important issues of this kind.

May I simply add that my own office is looking very closely at an award that may be offered to Ontario universities for significant contributions to all ways in which access may be broken for women into all of the barriers

that still exist in those institutions and in particular with respect to educational options.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORP CUTBACKS

Mr Dadamo: I spoke with the mayor of Windsor, John Millson, this morning and he, along with city councillors, the labour community, business and very concerned citizens in Windsor, is showing disgust and disapproval over the actions of the federal government in the dismantling of the CBC yesterday. They are launching a massive petition drive at a press conference being held this afternoon in Windsor. Windsor is being left with little or nothing at all for news and local programming. I am asking the Premier to join in this petition drive and call on all Ontarians to send their disapproval over this tearing apart of a coast-to-coast broadcast network.

Can the Premier assure this province that the fight is not over, and will he detail any action this government will take, starting today?

Hon Mr Rae: I appreciate the question. I want to assure the member that I am sure I share with most members of the House a sense of outrage, not simply a sense of regret, that the Conservative government of Canada would have taken this decision and would have cut off funds for a very necessary service for the people of this province as well as for the people of the rest of the country.

I regret it. I think it is a very sad day for Canada. The same week that the Prime Minister is talking about how important national unity is, he is allowing the CBC to cut back on an essential institution that has done a great deal for the whole country, and in particular for the citizens of Windsor.

I want to say to the member, first, that we are prepared to sit down with all the people in Windsor to talk about what alternatives are available. It is very difficult for us in this circumstance. We understand the CBC is not even willing to sit down with private investors at this point and talk about alternatives. I regret that approach. It seems to me that if you are going to cut off the service, the least you could do is be willing to sit down with others and discuss what the alternatives might be.

I hear from members of the Conservative Party that they want to know the difference between the Conservatives and the NDP. Yesterday they cut 1,200 jobs, the same week that the Treasurer is announcing that we are prepared to put money into the economy and create jobs. That is the difference between our approaches on this matter.

LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr Conway: I would like to pick up on the theme of jobs, and my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. As he will know, the current recession is ravaging the forestry sector. In my county of Renfrew, my calculation would suggest some 500 jobs have been lost within the past six months in the sawmill and related industries.

I am interested to know, and my question to the minister is simply this: What can the sawmill and forestry workers in communities like Pembroke, Barry's Bay, Braeside, Denbigh and Bancroft expect as the winter

approaches and as the recession deepens and as unemployment rises?

Hon Mr Wildman: There is no question there is a very serious problem in the sawmill industry in eastern Ontario and northern Ontario. As my friend will know, there are approximately 6,300 employees currently laid off in the forestry industry. Of those, only about 3,700 are eligible for unemployment insurance.

It is a very serious problem, and as the member will also know, in the announcement made by the Treasurer just this week and the subsequent announcements, there are a number of forestry-related jobs that are being provided through projects for improvements to forest stands to assist with silviculture in the future. A significant number of those jobs will be in the Algonquin region. To ensure that they will continue to have employment over the winter, we hope to employ cutters to cull poor-quality stands. The details of the actual numbers of jobs will be available in the next couple of days and I will be happy to share them with the member.

There is no question it is a very serious problem. In the immediate future, we are attempting to resolve it by providing short-term winter employment. In the longer term, we are having to look at how we can address the overall structural problems that appear to be developing in the sawmill industry.

Mr Conway: I appreciate the honourable member's response, and I do observe that in her statement to the House today, the Minister of Northern Development indicated that this winter this government will commit funds for 200 MNR jobs across all of northern Ontario, and certainly that is appreciated.

I repeat, however, in my county of Renfrew, in the heart of eastern Ontario, by my reckoning some 500 jobs have been lost within the past six to eight months in the forestry sector in that eastern county alone. What I want to know is what I can tell the unemployed and out-of-work sawmill and forestry workers in communities like Barry's Bay, Braeside and Pembroke, who are facing one of the worst winters in recent memory, and it is approaching very rapidly.

Two hundred jobs for all of northern Ontario is certainly appreciated, but for the 500 out-of-work forestry workers in my eastern county alone, the minister can appreciate the need that this announcement will not even begin to meet.

Hon Mr Wildman: I acknowledge the serious problems that we face in the sawmill industry. They relate to a number of things that are happening. In the paper industry, of course, a number of industrial disputes have made it difficult for the sawmills to market their chips, and that has led to layoffs. Overall, we are facing high interest rate policies from the federal government that have led to a downturn in the economy generally and to a decrease in the number of housing starts. In addition to that, we are facing the very difficult problem resulting from the 15% export tax which was imposed by the federal government as part of the free trade deal negotiations with the United States.

The member will know that the Premier has just written to the Prime Minister of Canada indicating that this province is supporting all other provinces, and I would hope all members of this House would join together in the effort to persuade the US government to agree to remove the 15% tax resulting from the memorandum of understanding.

Other than that, in terms of our efforts, I said we will be moving to assist the sawmill industry in restructuring and I would be happy to accept any suggestions the member has for assistance to the sawmill industry in his area.

1510

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Runciman: My question is for the Minister of Financial Institutions. On 20 December the House will vote on a private member's bill that I will be introducing later today. The bill would return the right to sue to all innocent accident victims of automobile accidents.

When the bill is debated, this government will have the chance to quickly rectify the injustice it fought so hard against last spring. Will the minister demonstrate today to the people of Ontario that he and his party meant what they said last spring and support this bill on 20 December?

Hon Mr Kormos: I can tell the member that I appreciate that he has every intention of presenting a bill. So do we. That is going to be done in the spring of next year, the spring of 1991. We began working on that almost immediately after acquiring the government on 1 October. If the member is proud of the bill he is going to table, wait until he sees the one we have got.

Mr Runciman: There is one person in this province injured every five minutes. This minister is telling us today and he has told us in the past in response to questions that we are simply going to have to wait. If we look back to last spring, he and his party, along with our party, were very actively and vigorously opposing this legislation. Now he is saying, "Wait and see, wait and see," while one person is being injured every five minutes in this province.

The minister asked during that debate, "Where is the compassion for innocent accident victims?" The compassion is encompassed in this bill. Will he give us any solid or compelling reason today why he and his party cannot or will not support my legislation on 20 December?

Hon Mr Kormos: As members know, we are working very hard talking to people across the province, including the auto insurance industry, to make sure that the legislation that we present to this assembly in a few months, in the spring of 1991, is legislation that is going to address the crisis that was created by the last government. I look forward to carrying on with that consultation because that is the way to do it.

Quite frankly, I am a little surprised that the member has not accepted my invitation to sit down and talk with me so that he can participate in that consultative process himself. We are doing it. We are going to keep on doing it. The legislation is going to be presented just as the throne speech promised.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE ELDERLY AND DISABLED

Ms Haslam: In contrast to many of the other questions, I will keep my comments brief and my question succinct. In my riding of Perth, 20% to 25% of the population experiences some difficulty with access to facilities because of age or disabilities. Could the Minister of Citizenship advise the House of details, in particular of her participation in the recently announced antirecession program?

Hon Ms Ziemba: I too will make my answer very short. As the government, we are very pleased to announce that we are adding \$1.13 million to our access fund. This will enable 39 more projects to have accessibility for both seniors and persons with disabilities. It is our commitment to make sure that all facilities in Ontario are accessible to all people.

PLANT CLOSURES

Mr Offer: I have a question to the Minister of Labour. As the minister is well aware, as everyone is well aware, we are in the midst of a recession. Thousands of jobs are being lost. In An Agenda for People it was stated quite clearly that they would establish a job protection board to establish whether plant closures are justified. Those promises were premised on the fact of a recession.

Again, I believe that this type of question is important not only to the employees and employers, but also to potential investors in this province. My question is, will the minister, as was specifically stated in An Agenda for People, bring forward legislation which demands plant closure justification?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: Plant closure justification is but one of a number of suggestions, that one specifically and others, that we will be bringing in when we bring in the labour adjustment programs and the amendments to the Employment Standards Act. It is because of the seriousness of the situation that we are taking a very close look at the legislation and what can be done with that legislation.

Mr Offer: I believe the minister in his response, if I heard correctly, said they would be looking very closely at the issue of plant closure justification.

It is interesting that he was able to bring forward to this House Bill 31, which specifically called for plant closure justification. At that point in time, as a member of the opposition, there was no question that he was specifically in favour of plant closure justification, that his party was specifically in favour of plant closure justification and it was found in An Agenda for People.

As a result of that particular answer, can we take it that it is now the minister's policy that he will not be bringing forward legislation which calls for plant closure justification?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: If the member is asking if I can assure him that it is now not our policy, that is incorrect. I can tell him that.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE CLINIC

Mr Sterling: Mr Speaker, I intend being in order this time.

I have a question for the Minister of Health. The Memory Disorder Clinic of Ottawa-Carleton gave official word yesterday that it was closing down because of a lack of funding. This community-based clinic has provided service to over 5,000 Alzheimer patients in the Ottawa-Carleton area. I understand the minister was unaware yesterday that this was taking place, but I am sure that she has found out about it. I was just wondering whether she will be able to provide this very important clinic with the funding that is needed.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: The member may be unaware that this is not the only clinic that provides service for Alzheimer patients and families at the Ottawa General Hospital. In fact, it was the decision of the Alzheimer Society that it was going to fold down the services of this particular clinic. They asked the Ottawa General to pick up the funding for the service. In fact, they suggested that a program to which the Alzheimer Society had contributed \$75,000, I believe it was, over a period of about four years be reinstituted with startup funds at around the level of \$340,000. The hospital declined to pick up that request.

The district health council has not given it priority and it really looks to me as if the service that is being provided through the other services at the clinic in the Ottawa General is meeting the needs that are identified both by the hospital and by the district health council and in the past by the Alzheimer Society.

Mr Sterling: I take it that the minister's answer is no, that this very important service to Alzheimer patients will not be available for the Ottawa-Carleton area.

Hon Mrs Gigantes: Perhaps the member is trying to substitute his judgement for what is the most important service in place of that of the district health council. If that is the case, maybe he would like to fund it himself.

1520

PLANT CLOSURE

Mr Mills: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. As the minister will no doubt be aware, the Delta Faucet plant in Bowmanville has announced it will be closing, and this closure will result in the layoff of 77 workers. Is there any assistance that the minister can offer to these employees in this very difficult time?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I want to thank the member for his question and tell him that I am aware of the situation at Delta Faucet. I understand the union and the company are working together to resolve some of the problems on the closure issue, and my ministry will be involved to see that the workers get everything they are entitled to under employment standards in the province of Ontario.

Mr Mills: This closure has affected both the workers and their families. This is just one example of the many closures we are seeing all across Ontario. Can the minister tell me what he is doing to ensure that workers are, as much as possible, protected in this unfortunately all-too-frequent situation?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I can tell the member that the notices of plant closures coming across my desk are coming at a disturbing rate these days, and certainly every closure affects the community at large. It is for that reason, as I answered to one of the opposition members earlier, that we are taking a very careful and detailed look at the Employment Standards Act in the province and will be bringing in recommendations as soon as we have them prepared.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Perhaps the member for York Centre would allow his own colleague the member for Kenora to place a question before the time expires.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr Miclash: My question is to the Minister of Energy. I would like to begin the question by quoting from the Thunder Bay Times of 17 August 1990, where his Premier said—I would like to quote:

"He restated a campaign promise made last week that the NDP government would empower the provincial energy commission to bring in a one-price system for gasoline in the province. 'I really think consumers are being ripped off by gas companies.'"

That was stated by the now Premier in Thunder Bay on 17 August 1990. We asked the minister twice yesterday, and she failed to give us a clear response. What we want to know today in this House is whether she is committed to meeting her party's promise to equalize gas prices across this province. We would like a straight answer from the minister.

Hon Mrs Carter: We are very concerned about gasoline prices in the north and we do feel for the people there. On the other hand, as I have mentioned, some of that discrepancy is local and is due to the retail situation in those places. A member of my staff is going to travel to that area within the next week or two and is going to personally investigate what the real situation is and where the problem is originating.

Mr McGuinty: It is unfortunate the Premier has left the House, because I am sure he would have some interest in this question. I am concerned with some conflicting information that has been coming from the ministry. In particular, it is prompted by an article which appeared in this morning's Globe and Mail. That article indicated Imperial Oil is contemplating leaving Ontario. That is based on a fear of some form of gas price controls, and that in turn is based on a fear of the implementation of an NDP campaign promise.

The conflicting information is as follows: On the one hand, we have the campaign promise to implement gas price controls and, in the same article, we have the deputy minister saying that Imperial Oil has nothing to worry about, that there is no legislation now or in the works for the regulation of gasoline prices, or even for the establishment of a regulatory board such as is in place in Nova Scotia; on the other hand, yesterday in this House the minister indicated that she was considering the possibility of alternative suppliers.

What I am doing is trying to clarify what the actual position of this government is. Could the minister please tell us simply whether she intends to honour her campaign promise to regulate gas price controls in the province?

Hon Mrs Carter: There seems to be two questions here. First of all, regarding Imperial Oil, we are advised by Imperial Oil itself that there is no plan to move its head office. Its chairman's comments were misinterpreted and the company would prefer to remain in Ontario. We have official correspondence to that effect.

Regarding regulating gasoline prices, as I said before, we are monitoring prices. We have no reason to believe that things have gone beyond what is reasonable at this point in time. We do have emergency plans; so does the federal government. At the moment, reserves of oil in the world are at a very high level, higher than is normal. There is no immediate prospects of any shortage, but if a shortage should occur, we are ready to deal with it.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Miss Martel moved that Mrs Cunningham and Mr Runciman exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

Motion agreed to.

1530

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

CITY OF LONDON ACT, 1990

Mr Winninger moved first reading of Bill 18, An act respecting the City of London.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Winninger: The city of London has buildings of great architectural significance and our city council has recognized that fact by designating some buildings under the Ontario Heritage Act. Unfortunately, under the current Ontario Heritage Act, buildings can only be designated for a period of up to 180 days, at which time the city has to issue a demolition permit.

This legislation would ensure, as do acts currently in place for the city of Toronto and for Markham, that owners of buildings designated under the Ontario Heritage Act can only demolish or remove a building after obtaining a building permit to erect a new building on the site of the building or structure sought to be demolished.

This legislation will serve to protect the Talbot Street block in London, the most extensive Victorian streetscape in southwestern Ontario, but also other residences such as the Thornwood estate, the second-oldest residence in London, where I am advised Winston Churchill slept. A developer has just applied for a demolition permit for the site.

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Sterling moved first reading of Bill 19, An act to amend the Professional Engineers Act, 1984.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Sterling: The purpose of this bill is to enable the registrar of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario to refuse to issue a licence to practise engineering to an applicant who has been convicted of sexual assault under the Criminal Code or who has engaged in sexual harassment.

INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Runciman moved first reading of Bill 20, An act to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Runciman: The bill I have just introduced will return to innocent victims of automobile accidents the right to sue, which the previous Liberal government callously removed last June.

As this House is well aware, the member for Welland-Thorold and I fought long and hard against the introduction of no-fault insurance. His party, led by the member for York South and Mr Swart, told Justice Osborne, "New Democrats want greatly improved benefits for accident victims, no matter who caused the accident. We also believe just as strongly that people must retain their right to sue."

This past spring—

The Speaker: It should not be necessary to remind an experienced member about the procedure in introducing bills: read the principle of the bill only.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ESTIMATES

Miss Martel moved resolution 6:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, the estimates transmitted to the House on Thursday 29 November 1990 be referred to the standing committee on estimates; that the estimates of not more than six ministries and offices be considered by the committee and be selected in one round by members of the committee as provided in standing order 57(b) (i), (ii), (c) and (d) with necessary modifications; that all other estimates not selected for consideration by the committee be deemed to be passed by the committee and be reported back to the House; that the report of the committee be deemed to be received and the estimates of the ministries and offices named in the report be deemed to be concurred in; that the committee present a report to the House on 18 March 1991 with respect to all of the estimates considered pursuant to this order; that in the event the committee fails to report the said estimates on 18 March 1991 the estimates be deemed to be passed by the committee and be deemed to be reported to and received by the House; and that a maximum of six hours be allocated for a debate on the orders for concurrence.

Mr Nixon: I wonder if the honourable member would clarify the purpose of this motion before we go into debate.

Hon Miss Martel: If I might, there was agreement among the House leaders that the standing committee on estimates would sit in—

Mr Nixon: That is okay. I was thinking of another one. Thank you very much.

Motion agreed to.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr Nixon: The reason I asked for some clarification on the government notice of motion is that one of them has to do with the approval of the House of certain regulations. I just thought perhaps the honourable House leader was proposing that the one dealing with regulations be brought forward. I noticed that on the order paper and did not understand its purpose; I did not want it carried without at least having some clarification, and I know that there will be.

I want to speak briefly on Bill 1, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act. I just thought that it might be interesting to note that the bill was introduced—

Hon Miss Martel: I am sorry to interrupt, but it seems to me that in the rotation, we were last and my colleague adjourned the debate, so I am just wondering if we can revert back to him after the Leader of the Opposition has completed. He will not be long.

The Speaker: I thought the Leader of the Opposition was rising to discuss motion 6, and I realize that by rotation, I believe it is the member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr Christopherson: My thanks to the Leader of the Opposition for his co-operation. I will be very brief in wrapping up my remarks on Bill 1.

I want to talk about two things today. First of all, I want to talk about the tax revolt issue that seems to be of particular concern to the opposition members, and rightly so; it is an important issue. But the opposition members have been attempting to make the case that there really has not been any kind of tax revolt and that there is very little happening. I would like to refute that, because on the contrary, I believe that there is an awful lot happening.

On the first point, I think it needs to be stated again that my colleague the member for Oxford talked about the court challenge and how much that means in Canadian law, how much impact that could have and what that means in terms of our role in leading a tax revolt.

Second, I get the impression from listening to the opposition members that they really would not be happy until we came marching into the House here with banners and trumpets going off, with T-shirts on and buttons, and completely brought the business of the House to a halt. I think that stereotypical caricature does an injustice to my party, as we are in government. The opposition parties have to do what is necessary and have to act accordingly. Labour leaders have to do what is necessary and act accordingly. Business people have to do what is necessary and act accordingly. As the government, we must do what is necessary and act accordingly.

In my book, \$500 million is an awful lot of leadership by any account. As the largest, most populous province with the strongest economy, with the leadership economy, if you will, in many ways, we have said we will not participate in the goods and services tax. It is going to cost us \$500 million, but it is that important to us that we are not

going to allow the GST to come in in the way the previous government wanted to.

To me that is leadership, excellent leadership, and I hope the opposition parties urge their counterparts who are also the governments in other provinces across the country to follow the kind of leadership we have shown. I think we are meeting the commitment we made in An Agenda for People in terms of leading a tax revolt.

1540

My last point, very briefly, is that one of the earlier members spoke of tax laws being introduced without any discussion and with very little deliberation. I think it needs to be said here that what is contained in Bill 1, except for all references to the GST where we threw out the bad ideas, is exactly, as I understand it from officials, what Bill 158 was that was introduced to first reading by the previous government and died on the order paper. I think it leaves hollow the argument that there has been very little discussion, in light of the fact that it was the official opposition that introduced that bill.

I think also that the issue of the vendor compensation, the increase there, which is going to cost this government about \$22 million a year, is also an excellent move, because as much as the opposition has problems with some of the paralleling of the legislation here with the GST legislation, it prevents, not causes—which I am interpreting from listening to the opposition—the fight against the GST from being fought on the backs of small business. Indeed, it recognizes that we need to be helping small business as much as we can.

All in all, I think we are providing exactly the kind of leadership Ontarians were looking for in tax changes and, in particular, in fighting the GST. I am pleased to be standing here in my place today supporting Bill 1.

Mr Ruprecht: I listened to the member for Hamilton Centre, and no matter how eloquent he thinks he might be on this item, the point is that I want to find out if he really understands what will happen when this kicks in. On 1 January it is going to affect every person in Ontario and, as I indicated before, what will happen almost immediately is that there will be, I would predict, massive unemployment and the effects that will reverberate through the whole economy are going to affect every one of us.

We did not expect the government to come into this Legislature and introduce some measures that will mitigate these circumstances only to a minor degree. We expected it to maintain and keep the promise it made. As a government, it made a promise to the people of Ontario and the promise was not that its members would come in with T-shirts or chain themselves to fences or do a circus act. The promise was that the government would do some fundamental changes, that it would stop the GST and that it would lead a tax revolt.

A tax revolt is not led by Bill 1. I think the government is seriously misunderstanding and underestimating what will take place on 1 January. I only wish that members of the government collectively would have enough guts and get together and do some act that is of significance to the people of Ontario. This is not good enough.

Mr White: I rise to speak to the issue the opposition has brought up, both in response to my friend here and at other times. I am concerned that while members of the opposition take great delight in bringing up our Agenda for People—I am sure they have studied each and every article of it and I hope they will find it as convincing as did the people of Ontario—I seem to recall an election campaign not so terribly long ago, wherein the third party opposite was abandoning its traditional links with another party by the same name that holds office in Ottawa and was saying that the GST was not a fair tax, just as we had said.

The Liberal Party was of course attempting to add the provincial sales tax on top of the GST, and now it is exhorting us to lead a national crusade. Well, certainly a strong part of our fight against the GST is this bill. Certainly it does not piggyback a tax upon a tax.

Where is the consistency when the official opposition was speaking in favour of this taxing a tax, and now it is speaking against it, something that it had as part of its policy, and the third party was attacking the GST and now it is attacking our attack upon it? Surely we should have consistency for all three parties, not simply upon ourselves, where we do in fact hold to our platform.

Mr O'Connor: I would like to support this bill, but just speak on comments that I have been hearing about the lack of a tax revolt.

As far as a tax revolt is concerned, there are a lot of members on this side of the House who were very active and worked very actively in a campaign for fair taxation last April. In fact, from my union Local 222 out of Oshawa, which I am a member of, we sent 6,000 ballots cast to Ottawa saying that no, we did not like the GST, that it was an unfair tax. As a matter of fact, the whole Canadian Auto Workers national union sent 98,000 ballots to Ottawa. The Canadian Union of Public Employees in Oshawa sent another 4,000.

There are an awful lot of people out there and people on this side of the House who led an active revolt against the GST. To further that revolt, it was carried forward on 6 September when the people of Ontario said: "No, we do not want the tax. Maybe we might just change the sales tax and maybe we might not change the sales tax."

We told them we were not going to tax a tax and that is what has happened: We are not taxing a tax. Bill 1 completely reiterates what has been said in An Agenda for People and during the campaign, that we are not going to tax a tax. The people of Ontario sent a message that they did not want to have that tax on the tax, and that is exactly what is being presented in Bill 1.

I rise in support of it and in support of the speaker on this, because I do believe that we have led a revolt and are continuing to lead this revolt and continuing to lead the province. The province of Ontario won on 6 September when they put us here to govern. What they expected from us was the answer they are getting right now, that no, we will not tax that tax.

Mr Sola: I find the definition of tax revolt in this House a little bit strange. It seems more like a tax whimper. In opposition, the present government lectured

us, when they sat on this side of the House, about our approach to the GST. Now they change their side of the House and it seems they change the side of their mouth they are speaking from.

By the member's own admission, their approach or their tax revolt is taking a Liberal measure, recycling it and tinkering with it a little bit. Now, if that is a revolt, why did they lecture us continuously in the last session about our approach to the thing? This is not a tax revolt. This is hopping on the bandwagon and trying to hide behind the fact that they are not taxing on tax.

They are actually taking very few measures that would be considered anything close to a revolt, close to any sort of objection to what the federal government is doing. They are just hiding behind the federal government and trying to escape from the notice of the public with this measure.

1550

Mr Christopherson: So many things to comment on and such little time. The member for Parkdale said that what people were looking for was fundamental changes. Then the previous speaker, I believe the member for Mississauga East, said that this is just mere tinkering. I do not believe that for a minute, and neither do I think the Ontario public is going to buy that this is just tinkering or that there are not fundamental changes between Bill 158 and Bill 1.

The fact of the matter is that \$500 million is a major effort on the part of any government. What we have done is shown leadership. We are out in front of this issue and we are saying here is where we stand on the issue of a sales tax on the GST.

There are limited things we can do as a provincial government, and everybody in this House knows that, but I think we are doing everything that could possibly be done. If every province in this country passed a measure similar to ours—where it is appropriate, understanding Alberta's situation, etc—and if, when we got into the next federal election, those positions were unanimous across the country and the GST was kept alive as a political issue and that was something the federal Tories were still standing behind, I dare say that the Tories would be lucky if they still had party status in the House by the time that election was done.

That is leadership. That is the kind of role Ontario has played in the past on issues. The leader of the official opposition called for leadership earlier on the constitutional matters. I think this is the kind of leadership that Ontario can show and is showing, and I am pleased that the first bill in this House is an anti-GST measure.

Mr Nixon: I am interested in reading this bill, as I had quite a bit to do with its preparation. Most of its provisions are similar to legislation that was introduced by the previous government, with the exception, of course, of the first section, which is an important principle. I hope to deal with that to some extent in a few moments.

The idea of a tax revolt is interesting and probably a little irrelevant. Everybody knows there is nothing that either this House or even the Premier and his majority can do to stop the tax. The valiant Liberal senators, in their all-night efforts in discussing the tax, may be able to stop it

indefinitely; my own suspicion is that they will not be able to do that and that the Progressive Conservative government of Canada will in fact give final legislative and parliamentary approval to impose the GST as originally planned.

We can say that we regret this and that it is a very serious matter and it will have effects on the economy of the province that have already been discussed by people more knowledgeable than I. I thought I would just speak briefly about the bill itself, however, and point out two or three of its provisions that I find particularly interesting.

One of them deals with the compensation for vendors which was established when sales taxes first came into the province in 1961. It is interesting to note that the federal bill does not provide any compensation for those people who will be collecting the 7% goods and services tax if in fact it becomes the law on 1 January.

There was some considerable thought given as to why the compensation should be increased. It certainly had been seen by the vendors as inadequate, but naturally it was not the aim of the government or the previous government, the Conservatives who started the compensation program, to really pay for it but simply to recognize the fact that the vendors do work very hard as tax collectors on our behalf. Most days, particularly at this time of year, the revenue from sales tax comes in at approximately \$30 million a day. It is an interesting aspect to bear in mind.

I suppose I am not revealing any particular secrets when I tell the members that in my own mind there is the feeling that as the vendors have to take on the payment of the 7% GST on 1 January, we would like them to be thinking positively and well of their provincial tax masters, and the fact that we would be improving that compensation was one of the ways we intended to do that. All of these vendors, of course, understand clearly that the tax they collect is not their own money but in fact public money and must be returned in the appropriate time.

The vendors who collect the sales tax and who will be collecting the federal sales tax after 1 January, sometimes illegally and inappropriately start spending the people's money. We know that that has to be inveighed against in every possible way and that there are severe penalties for anyone who does that and fails to reimburse the crown appropriately. We just thought that in case there was a choice the vendor had to make at the end of the month, by improving this compensation we might not be the ones who would be found wanting in this regard.

It was even suggested at one stage that the reporting date might be changed so that the province gets its money ahead of the federal government. I hope the minister would continue to think of that, because in most respects I believe that the ministry over the years, going back to 1961, has had about as good a relationship with the vendors as is possible. Certainly the vendors objected substantially when sales taxes began in Ontario. I was just newly in opposition at that time, and in those days the Liberal opposition was leading the revolt against the provincial sales tax at the unheard-of level of 3%, which we felt was going to dislocate the economy of the province. Circumstances have proved us correct in that regard; the

economy of the province has never been the same. Also, the revenues of the province have never been the same; they have been substantially improved.

This now is considered a reasonable way for the province to gain a substantial amount of its revenue. I believe the sales tax is maybe the second largest source of revenue after personal income tax, and the third is direct transfers from the government of Canada, which we all know in this House are seriously inadequate; we will talk about that on another occasion.

The bill also deals with confidentiality, which I believe is important, the keeping of records and certain areas where our requirements are brought into relevancy, if not precise equality, with the provisions of the GST as they come forward.

I can recall in my previous responsibilities as Treasurer having discussions about the goods and services tax when it was still just a mild thought in the minds of Mr Wilson and Mr Mulroney. I think it should, however, be said in all fairness that this matter was before the public, at least in some minor way, at the last federal election. The only time it got on the front pages, as I recall, was when Mr Mulroney, seeking re-election, had indicated that part of their program would be tax reform and that they began the tax reform by lowering income tax and certain other taxes, and indicated that after the election the second stage of reform would be the imposition of a new federal sales tax. I think at that time they called it the national sales tax instead of the goods and services tax.

A lot of people did not seem to understand what had clearly been stated, that federal tax reform would be in two phases: one, a reduction in taxes, which everybody thought was great; and two, the imposition of a new tax, and everybody voted for them anyway. So there is a certain irrationality when you look at the situation.

I made a projection then which got on the front page of the *Globe and Mail* on a Saturday during the federal campaign. I refuted the contention of the Minister of Finance, Mr Wilson then as he is now, that it would not be revenue-neutral, that in fact our calculations indicated there would be a \$5-billion to \$7-billion gain on the tax as it then was proposed at 9%.

There was a great deal of furore. As a matter of fact, I was contacted directly by a senior elected person in the federal government objecting to the views I had expressed, since the Minister of Finance had indicated clearly that this tax would be revenue-neutral because there would be monthly payments to all of the people in the country whose incomes were less than about \$30,000 and that all of that extra money would be used up in making these payments and certain other matters so that the tax would go in raising no net dollars whatsoever compared with the present manufacturers' sales tax.

It is interesting now to hear the Minister of Finance for Canada say the tax makes sense because we need the extra money to pay down the deficit. They spent a lot of money in an advertising campaign to indicate that this deficit was out of control—that is perhaps my description, not theirs—that the tax was needed to bring this matter under control, so that at various times in the campaign it has been

described as revenue-neutral, which I never believed it was, and now is referred to as something that is needed for the good of the country, which I do not believe it is.

1600

But the tax, we expect, is going to be enacted, and there is no sense fooling ourselves. There is no revolt here or in any other province that is going to be of any significance. The placard-carrying citizenry expressing the 80% objection to the tax has faded to some extent, and even the reports of the Liberal Senate filibuster are now relegated to the pages where the advertisements for medical supplies and things are normally placed. So the people have sort of lost interest in this, and I regret that. In spite of the contention from the NDP when it was seeking election that it would lead a revolt against this, the significance of that is of course now seen to be irrelevant and simply political posturing.

I recall, frankly, something I said in an earlier debate, that there were people in the province, not including myself, who indicated that they thought the Liberal Party in the election of 1987, when it indicated it was going to veto the free trade agreement, was taking a certain political posture there. Of course I reject that, but in the same way the government that was then elected did everything it could not only to stop the free trade agreement but to mitigate its effects on the community, to the positive results that everybody here is aware of.

There is a certain parallel there that I think should embarrass the supporters of the New Democratic Party when they think of how irrational they were in their comments about the very responsible and deliberate approach taken by the Liberal government in those days.

What all this means is that there are several black pots in this particular argument. Whatever we think is going to happen, we might as well assume that the Goods and Services Tax Act will be enacted, God forbid, and that it is time the government of the day thought about what it is going to do about that tax.

That brings me to section 1. I will deal with that briefly, because it is obvious that while my colleagues and I are not going to vote against any tax reduction, this is not the way to reduce taxes. The New Democratic Party, as somebody just mentioned a few minutes ago, makes a virtue of consistency. Some people think that is the hobgoblin of modern thought, but they make a virtue of consistency and therefore we must presume the officials in the Ministry of Revenue will be removing the sales tax from the tire tax, they will be removing the sales tax from the cigarette tax and they will be removing the sales tax from the federal tax on telephone bills—and those are just three instances where for consistency they are going to have to have a number of amendments to various tax acts and the Treasurer is going to have to make do with substantially reduced revenue.

Surely, instead of trotting out this sort of hobgoblin known as tax on tax, which registers with people as unacceptable in spite of the fact that we have had it here since before Confederation, it would be better for the government to level with the people and say, "We believe taxes are too high and therefore the sales tax will be reduced."

Without making a particularly political presentation at this time, I simply have to say that of course the Liberal Party indicated during the election that if the goods and services tax were to proceed, we would mitigate the effects on our economy by reducing the sales tax in the province from 8% to 7%. That would forgo \$1.1 billion in revenue for a full year and would put it in the hands of the consumers. They could then save it or they could go and buy a new car or refrigerator or whatever they wanted to do in order to provide for their own requirements and also stimulate the economy.

I would just say to members, and that is not what we are voting on now, that it makes eminent good sense to put the tax on the tax. If the members opposite are going to be consistent they are going to have to bring in all sorts of changes, because the basis of the sales tax in this province and most other provinces, particularly those with significant revenues from this source, is that the sales tax at the provincial level is a retail sales tax and it is payable on whatever the cost of the good or service would otherwise be.

We believe in the reduction of taxes. The honourable Treasurer has indicated in the policy of the government that he expects over the next four and a half years or however long the government survives, assuming it goes past Christmas, that he will raise taxes by \$2.4 billion. The implication in the election campaign was that only rich people would pay that—rich people and Inco. I am not sure if that was a direct quote, but that was the implication.

We know that when the Treasurer starts paying the bills around here it is going to be all of us overworked and underpaid people, and the honourable members in the New Democratic Party would agree that it is all of us, that we will be paying the taxes along with the other nine million people in this province. I think a time of recession is not the time to raise taxes; it is the time to reduce taxes.

It is interesting to note that there is going to be the involvement of totally unnecessary additional complexity by the passage of section 1, which parallels the provincial sales tax with the goods and services tax as it becomes payable. It assumes that in each instance the vendor is going to apply the goods and services tax separately and on the basis of the purchase. I would predict to members that within a very few months indeed most vendors will simply hang a plaque up on the wall saying that the federal goods and services tax at 7% is applicable to all goods and services in this particular establishment.

Any members who have travelled in Europe, such as the Minister of Agriculture and Food, who is occupying a corner suite in the Hotel Par Excellence in Brussels at the present moment, would know that whenever you pay a bill in Europe, whatever it costs it says VAT included, value added tax included; it is not separately calculated.

It is my understanding that it is the aim of the revenue officials in the government of Canada, the Progressive Conservative government of Canada, that as soon as possible the goods and services tax would disappear into the actual purchase price of the good or service. There will be some people who will want to charge it separately for a long time simply to prove the point that they are totally

opposed to the tax, and I certainly hope they continue to do so. I would think that when our barber downstairs, who does such a good job in making all of us presentable from time to time, applies the goods and services tax he is going to make some comment that "There's 7% for Brian," and that sort of stuff. Great politics; should be kept up as long as possible.

But before long, in most of the business we do—certainly it has been found in all other jurisdictions—the goods and services tax will disappear other than as an argument in the House of Commons and in the barbershop and probably in this chamber here. The particular vendor would otherwise have embedded the tax in it, however appropriate that might be, but for everybody's convenience he/she may very well do this: reduce that purchase price by 7% then enlarge it again by 8%. If there is enough money in the world to provide cash registers that are going to do that, I would be very much surprised.

I would predict that even before this Legislature goes back to the people for their review of our stewardship of their affairs, this will be changed so that the tax will be levied on tax, and the vendors and others will ask for that purpose. This does not mean that we are in favour of higher taxes. I simply reiterate that the way to approach this is upfront, not with political posturing and related baloney. It is to reduce the sales tax. It is clear, and economists and clear thinkers like the former Treasurer of Ontario are telling you clearly, that the way to put money back in the pockets of people is to bring in an act reducing the provincial sales tax from 8% to 7%. That makes sense, it is appropriate and it is the course that should be taken. I would say that regarding Bill 1, however enthusiastic the NDP members may be—"We are relieving the people of paying tax on tax"—they are misleading those people, because they continue to have laws that have tax on tax. Unless they are going to clean that up with all of the elaborate amendments and confusion that that will cause, then surely Bill 1 should be replaced by a section that reduces the sales tax in the province of Ontario from 8% to 7%.

1610

Mr Mills: I am privileged to stand here today in this House. I have listened to the Leader of the Opposition with some interest. In the past I had the dubious honour of working for the Ministry of Revenue, and I understand all its tax plays very well and ably. I must say I do not agree with his position as stated on Bill 1.

Mr Hope: The Leader of the Opposition states he is an intelligent man, I guess he is. I have heard him speak quite a bit. And he is a financial whiz, as we have all been quoted and are hearing many times. What I would like to ask him is, is it not true that the calculated figure the federal government has put forward is more than a negotiated figure? We have been seeing consistency in advertising that the deficit is larger than predicted. Is that not a clear signal to those who are catching on to the political system that this is only a way to increase the 7% to maybe 9%, 10%, 11% or 12%? Who knows where Brian will stop.

The thing is, there has been a revolt going on, and I think the people of the labour movement and other small business groups have been in the forefront of the fight. The fight is still there, and I do not think anybody will die from the fight. But the member's suggestion is that we lower it to 7%, that we piggyback it on top of the federal. Would it not be, in a sense, taking advantage of people? When the goods and services tax increases, his level then increases also.

Mr Bisson: I just rise to ask a couple of questions in regard to what the honourable Leader of the Opposition was mentioning. I think when we talk about the whole question of the tax revolt, the revolt does not stop here. I am sure members are aware of that. This government has announced that it is not only the question of Bill 1, that it is not going to, how do you say, cure all the ills in regard to the taxation problem that we have in this province. This government has clearly demonstrated from the beginning that we want a Fair Tax Commission on the whole question of taxation in this province.

I am sure the members of the opposition, the same as the members from this side, are going to give input in regard to how the taxation system in this province has to be set up so that it is fair not just to workers or families or businesses but a system that maybe is not perfect for everybody but that everybody can live with and that is, at least, fair. I think that is what the heart of this whole thing is.

I am quite happy with what this government has done in regard to the whole question of Bill 1. I think Bill 1 states clearly to the people of this province up front that what we are interested in doing is saying: "Whoa, stop. Let's put the brakes on. We will not collect a tax on top of a tax." Clearly, the Leader of the Opposition, I think, has to agree with us. He is saying that what we should be doing is collecting our provincial tax on top of the GST; then after that what we should be doing is reducing the provincial sales tax by 1%.

A couple of points, I think, have to be made. First of all, when the member's party came to power, one of the things it did in its term of office was to raise the tax by 1%. Okay? Let's be clear. I do not mean to be malicious about that, but let's be clear about this whole issue.

I think what this government has said is, "Let's put the brakes on this whole issue, let's not put ourselves in line with the federal government, let's say we will not collect our provincial sales tax on top of the GST and let's make sure that we make the system of collection much easier for the merchants," because really that is what the legislation in that bill is saying. It is setting up a system that is paralyzing the collection system, not the tax itself.

Mr Nixon: I am concerned that the member for Durham East considered it a dubious honour to work in the Ministry of Revenue. I hope he was not serious about that adjective, because that particular ministry has a nationwide reputation of service. If I had known when I was minister that he was worried about working there, I might have been able to assist him in terminating. As a matter of fact, the last time I think I saw the honourable member was in a

parking lot of a legion. I was making an excellent speech. He and his followers were hitting me over the head with a sign or something like that. I found that meeting with the honourable member somewhat dubious.

Certainly I want to make this abundantly clear: It is not that we are considering doing what Quebec has announced and piggybacking on the federal tax. I believe that would be a mistake. This might be a shock to some people listening to me, but I would never approve, as far as I am concerned, a kind of a piggyback approach that the member, I think, for Chatham-Kent may have mentioned. It could very well be that the federal goods and services tax, starting at 7%, will end at 10%. With our 7% or 8%, that would be an overall tax of 18%. The member for Cochrane South, who is good at these things, could tell members exactly what the percentage would be if it were compounded.

You need only go to all the other countries in the world where there is a value added tax and it extends from about 14% to 22% or 23%, God forbid. The way the federal government is spending money, if Mr Wilson hangs around here for very long and if he is serious about reducing his deficit, we may end up with a 30% tax. I do not know what he intends to do, because the second Minister of Finance for Canada, the Prime Minister, is never going to let him do anything to these costs.

Mr Mills: I am honoured and I am privileged to stand here today in this House as the member for Durham East and to take part in this debate on Bill 1.

This is the first time I have had the opportunity to speak here. I would like to offer my congratulations to you, Deputy Speaker, on your appointment, and to the Speaker, who is not here, but it is customary to thank him. At the same time, I would like to thank the members of the official opposition for their kindness, their gestures, their words of welcome, and also I would like to include in that group the members of the third party, who have been very kind to me over the two weeks that we have been sitting here in this House. It is indeed very refreshing to me to know that friendship in this House extends across the floor and goes beyond party lines. I appreciate that.

I would be remiss today if I did not pay my respects to the former member for Durham East, Sam Cureatz. Sam served as the member for Durham East for 13 years. He served the region very well and very ably, and he was well liked. He was well liked not only in this House; he was very well liked in Durham East by the constituents. I have no doubt that I have a serious job to fill Sam's shoes here. I intend, however, to try to serve all the people in Durham East with zeal, with compassion, with humility and, above all, with honesty. I intend to do my best for everyone, every day, no matter what his station in life is.

As a young man growing up in England, I would often go up to London and sit in the House of Commons during those heady days of the first Labour government that was elected after the Second World War. These debates had a profound effect on me and the life I followed. I was so moved by the concern shown by those members of that Labour government over the injustices of the time in the

United Kingdom that I became a member of the Labour Party. I am very proud to say that I did that.

1620

In 1957, I came to Canada to compete here on the basis of what I could do rather than that of having my abilities judged on the people whom I knew. My election to this Legislature as a member of the New Democratic Party is a dream that really did come true for me. I will be honest in saying that it will take me a while to feel and be comfortable here. The shock to my system has been traumatic.

The people who call Durham East their community want what most people strive for. They need reassurance and support, and they ask for stability which they can plan a life around. They share these simple values with the other man and they expect him to reflect that. They gain strength in building a community on the integrity of the government that they chose to elect.

Durham East has factory workers who proudly assemble automobiles, and small businessmen who still greet their trade by their first names. There are urban city workers who commute for several hours each day to the towers of Toronto and home to their sprawling subdivisions. We have some farmers who walk no further than the short distance to the milking stalls and whose twice-daily responsibility is to the black-and-white simplicity of the cows that too come to and fro the meadows.

Mr Speaker, like you and me, no matter where we live and what trade we practise, we seek fairness in the taxation. We in Durham East are encouraged by the government's decision not to piggyback the Ontario retail sales tax on the GST.

My constituents and I applaud the Minister of Revenue for putting \$500 million back into the pockets of the people. A number of members in the opposition have said in the debate that we are not keeping our election promise of stopping the GST. They claim we are not fighting hard enough, and the honourable member for Mississauga West, who is not here at this moment, but I wish he had been, said we should go—

Mrs Marland: He's here.

Mr Mills: I beg your pardon, Mr Speaker, the honourable member is here. He suggested yesterday that we should chain ourselves to the Peace Tower in Ottawa. I would like to suggest to the honourable member that perhaps he would like to go this weekend to Ottawa to chain himself to the Peace Tower and thereby give some solidarity to those Liberal senators who seem very discordant.

The people in Durham East are, for the most part, outraged at the GST, and they have not paid a penny on it yet. The consequences of the GST are frightening, and I shudder to think of the months ahead.

This government is fighting the GST with the best weapon we know—through the judicial system of the Canadian courts. I am very pleased to know that despite their colleagues in Ottawa being the author of the GST, the members of the third party indeed is going to support Bill 1, and I thank them for that.

I have a great interest in small business in Durham East, and a few weeks ago I had the opportunity to speak at Durham College at the commencement of Small Business Week. From my discussions with the owners of small businesses, they are delighted with the decision not to piggyback the retail sales tax on the GST.

This government is not one-dimensional. It has the concerns of all in its Agenda for People.

In closing, I would like to say that at every turn during the past election campaign, the question uppermost in the minds of people from Durham East was the GST. I said then that this government, if elected, would never piggyback retail sales tax on top of the GST. I am pleased to stand here today knowing this government kept its promise.

I am an eternal optimist, and despite the gloom of the members of the opposition and the members of the third party, I really believe that there is hope yet at this very late hour that the GST will not become a *fait accompli*.

Mr Mahoney: I think speeches like that could get that guy in the Senate one day. I would not be at all surprised. He could be the first NDP member in there, even though he probably thinks it should be abolished. I am sure, just like his federal counterparts, he says: "On one hand, we should abolish the Senate; and on the other hand, aren't they doing wonderful things stalling the GST? Keep up the fight."

There is nothing like the party of the left for consistency. It constantly amazes me—as the Minister of Labour sits there throwing barbs across that I cannot hear over my eloquence and do not wish to. What the member has done is simply continue that fine tradition of his federal counterparts. Before they were government, when they were over here, they were going lead a revolt.

We were pointing out yesterday that the member for Victoria-Haliburton was proud of the fact that he got arrested leading a revolt before. Fine. It was my suggestion that he do the same thing here. He is in the House now with us; it is nice to see him today. It was my suggestion that he chain himself to the Peace Tower, that he indeed send out the message that the NDP is not going to take this from Mr Mulroney and his counterparts. But that is not what he has done.

What the honourable minister has done is that he has brought in a bill that just sort of pulls back the sheets and says, "Move over, Brian, I'm coming in." It is amazing. Here was Brian all by himself lying in the centre of the bed. The members all jumped in on the left-hand side, and what are they doing? They are propping him up. I do not know how they live with themselves. I do not know how they look in the mirror at night.

Mr Ruprecht: I listened to the remarks from the member for Durham East quite attentively and I would like to ask him just two questions. Before I do, I was surprised to hear that when he was elected, he was shell-shocked, so shocked in fact that he remembered what happened in the Parliament in Britain. I kind of thought that he would not try to tell us about the experiences there, be-

cause I hope what has recently happened in Britain is not going to happen to the leader of the NDP.

The Deputy Speaker: Back to the topic.

Mr Ruprecht: I hope that he is not going to impose these kinds of conditions on us.

I was going to ask the member for Durham East what he and his party are going to do with the tire tax. Is their exemption going to decrease the tire tax? What will he do with the tobacco tax, which is already being imposed? Will this legislation, Bill 1, affect the tobacco tax? What I would like to know are the specifics of Bill 1. How will the specifics in Bill 1 affect these kinds of taxes? I would request that the member for Durham East, or whoever over there is going to be an expert on this legislation, stand up and explain to us this specific situation.

1630

Mr Villeneuve: May I first of all congratulate the member for Durham East for making a very good speech. As he mentioned, he does have a large pair of boots to fill because his predecessor was a very colourful member of this assembly. Actually, he sat in the chair you sit in, Mr Speaker, and had very good control of this Legislature while he was in the chair. He would now and again come in with seagulls and things like that, but that was quite understandable and acceptable. He always got his message across for the people he represented and they always came first.

I also want to say to the member for Durham East that I was most pleased to see him in my riding very shortly after he was elected in his position as, I believe, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services. He certainly did a good job in Kemptville, as he represented the minister well, and I was pleased to see him join the great people of eastern Ontario.

I say to the member, he should make sure that his colleagues do not forget us in eastern Ontario. We do have some economic problems there and we do need some assistance, not only the north and the city of Toronto. We do need help down there. Again, to the minister, to the member for Durham East—he may be a minister some day, but right now he is, as we are, a simple backbencher. I say that not facetiously, but with a degree of understanding, because I have been there too. He is welcome to the club and he will enjoy it.

Mr Callahan: I just wanted to rise too—a bit of the thunder was stolen by the former speaker—to speak about the member who preceded the member for Durham East in this House. He was in fact extremely colourful. When he got in full flight, you were not sure if he was going to take off or land. He in fact occupied, I think, the seat I am sitting in right now and the seat is still moving.

But I really wanted to rise and say to the member that I wish him good luck, good luck, good luck. If he ever gets depressed over there, we would be happy to have him move over here. That is what Sam always used to say in fact. Sam was always working underground. He would be trying to get people over here. In those days, it was necessary because the Conservative Party of the day, if it got one more member, I think it was—

The Deputy Speaker: The issue is Bill 1.

Mr Callahan: I am sorry. If it got one more member, then it could have debated Bill 1 a little longer and it would have become the official opposition and its members might be sitting over there instead of those people and those people would be over here as the third party, but that is not the case.

But I would like to say in closing that I would appreciate it if the member would pass on my sincere hello to the former member and tell him we are debating Bill 1 today in the House.

Mr Mills: I would like to thank, really from the bottom of my heart, the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry and the member for Brampton South for the comments I have heard from them. I have not become familiar with all the ridings yet, and I thank the member for Parkdale.

I included my background in my speech—for the benefit of the members—because I have followed the political scene both in England and here and I must confess that I was a constant watcher of this channel and of the people in this House before my election. I always thought the member for Mississauga West was lively on television, but I have come to understand that, when I see him in the flesh, it is like watching a hockey game. When you see it on TV and you go there and watch it, it is an entirely different thing, and this is what I found out with the honourable member for Mississauga West.

I thank them all for their comments and their welcome and I will pass on to Sam, who constantly calls me and drops into the office to see how I am doing, all the members' good wishes and messages. I am a little bit subdued here, but hopefully, by the time the five years are up that we sit here, I shall indeed be remembered as much as my friend Sam Cureatz.

Mrs McLeod: I can assure members I do want to engage in the debate about Bill 1. In fact, I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing some of the surprise, if not indeed a degree of shock, that the first bill of this new government would in fact be a bill that prepares the ground for the successful implementation of the GST.

There are some who might suggest that this implies acquiescence with the GST. I know in fact that is not true so I will not make that suggestion. As our leader and former Treasurer suggested earlier, I really do not think there is room for political posturing on something that we all take quite as seriously as this.

It is nevertheless, I think, an implied, resigned acceptance of the tax that this government was committed to fight. There are times when surprise kind of leaves one searching for words to catch a sense of what has happened, and I must confess that the day that this Legislature resumed, with all the significance of a new government taking office and reading its first speech from the throne and presenting its first piece of legislation, was a day of surprise for me, a day of surprise and indeed really a day of shock. The only words that came to my mind as I tried to think about how I could express my feelings of the day

were snatches of an old poem by T. S. Eliot that has a refrain that goes: This is the way the world ends, not with a bang but a whimper.

Bill 1 certainly is not a revolt. It is not even a so-called revolt, whatever the revolt was expected to look like, and indeed it is not even a whimper of resistance. I think my colleague the member for Mississauga East used the same kind of term in saying this was not even a whimper of a revolt.

I guess I was a little bit surprised that the statement that was made in presenting Bill 1 just simply talked about the necessity of avoiding confusion with the GST. There was no ringing statement of repugnance about this federal tax that certainly this new government and I think most Liberals and a majority of Canadians feel really is the wrong tax at the wrong time.

There was no clear indication of continued opposition. There was not even a hint of defiance. I would have thought that the new government, if it believed, as well it might, that the legislative position on the GST had to be in place before 1 January, might have wanted to slip this in rather quietly, that it would not have wanted to draw attention to it on the grand opening day as if it were something to set forward with pride as the first major step in meeting its new commitments. I think that the new government might at least have said, "We don't like this any better than you do but they made us do it."

Perhaps they thought that the decision not to tax the tax would seem like a ringing message to consumers about the government's concern; but nothing is really very simple, least of all managing the economy of the province.

A number of my colleagues, most recently our leader and former Treasurer, pointed out that the decision not to tax the tax means forfeiting some \$530 million of potential revenue and provides no replacement for revenue loss when the existing federal sales taxes are removed.

My friend and colleague our leader and former Treasurer did teach me one thing that was very simple about managing the economy of the province. He used to say there are only three ways to find the money that will be needed for escalating costs, for new programs, for expanded programs. Those three ways are to cut existing programs, to borrow money to increase the deficit or to create new revenue.

Let us look at the options that this government has if it finds that money indeed must be found and it gets past the point where it can simply blame the federal government for its failure to increase the transfer payments.

Obviously they cannot cut programs. They have promised \$2 billion in new programs, and that is not even counting the additional costs that are being incurred as our welfare rolls increase and the costs of meeting those needs get greater and greater, or the declining revenues that may come from the recession. They clearly cannot become involved in cutting programs and, quite frankly, we would not want to see them cut programs.

We would not want to see this government reduce the job creation programs that are going to be so necessary to help people deal with the impact of the recession. We would not want to see them cut any of the economic

initiative programs that are going to help us recover from a recession. We certainly would not want to see them cut programs of support for people who are on welfare, people for whom this new federal GST is going to be most difficult of all.

1640

There may be some thought that they can cut expenditures by finding ways to cut waste from existing government programs, but I can assure the members opposite, as my colleague the member for Renfrew North did yesterday, that that is not a simple route, not an easy route, but one that is fraught with considerable challenge and a great deal of anguish and pain.

The second option I think we have to look at is the option of further increasing the deficit. That one seems to be no longer open. I know that the new government is not reluctant to see the deficit increase. During the campaign they indicated that they would expect to see a deficit in the order of some \$2 billion. But the Treasurer seems to have indicated in his statement on Tuesday that the anticipated deficit would be held—if we can use a figure of holding a deficit—at \$2.5 billion. That is clearly the reality he speaks of. He seems to be saying now that the deficit will be held at that figure.

I do not know all that he takes into account in that figure of \$2.5 billion and I think we will look forward to examining that in some future budget presentations and debates. I suspect that with a deepening recession and with the likelihood of further decreasing revenues, it is going to be difficult enough to hold the deficit even at that very high level, especially if the new government intends to keep the commitments that it has made to any degree at all.

If the promises are to be kept, if the expectations are to be met, there seems to be really only one alternative left, and that is to create new revenues by raising new taxes. I know that when the members of this new government were campaigning, they talked not about new taxes but about fairer taxes. The members will forgive me if I am a little sceptical about that at the moment since I have no idea what was intended by fairer taxation. I do not know what it will look like, I do not know when we will see it and I do not know what impact it will have. So I have to find myself wondering what new taxes might be looked at to make up for the lost revenue.

During the campaign we also made some statements about the GST and its impact and about taxation policy. One of the things we said very clearly was that we would not tax any goods or services not currently taxed in the province of Ontario. I would have wanted to hear that kind of statement from this new government as it introduced Bill 1. I would have wanted to hear them make a statement that they will absolutely not extend the provincial sales tax to any goods or services not currently taxed, because I think the extension of the GST to that full range of services is one of the most repugnant aspects of the new goods and services tax proposed.

I do not know where the new needed revenue might come from. We cannot be sure now, but one thing that I think we can be sure of now is that without the tax on tax,

there is not likely to be a reduction in the overall sales tax. As our leader and former Treasurer pointed out, that was the alternative that we put forward during the campaign. We were prepared to tax the tax, not to extend the tax to the full range of goods and services taxed by the GST, but to continue to tax the areas that we currently tax.

But we were also going to reduce the sales tax by a full percentage point, and that would have put more than \$1 billion into the pockets of Ontario's consumers. This government has made different choices, but I happen to prefer ours.

The real concern I want to speak to today is the impact of the goods and services tax on the northern part of this province and this government's seeming lack of response to this impact. Even with the introduction of Bill 1, it is clearly understood that the GST is likely to become a reality.

The Minister of Northern Development earlier this week presented an interprovincial report which states the very serious problems that the GST creates for the north. But Bill 1 does nothing to address these problems and it seems that there are no other proposals forthcoming or even promised to accompany Bill 1's recognition that the GST will be a reality.

Let me just mention two or three of the areas that the minister mentioned earlier this week. First, there is a tax on transportation costs for manufacturers, which is going to create significant additional costs for northern businesses. I do not think I need to tell any members present who are from northern Ontario the struggles that businesses in northern Ontario now have to deal with the added costs of communication and transportation.

If this GST is to be a reality, as Bill 1 suggests, something must be done to offset the new barriers to sustaining business in the north. It is so easy for us to talk about the importance of diversification in northern Ontario, how we are going to be able to balance the dependence on resource-based industries with new businesses, new industries. But unless we can find some way to deal with the very real barriers, barriers that are going to be increased with the imposition of the GST, then all we are talking about when we talk of diversification are really words and vague hopes.

The interprovincial report that the Minister of Northern Development presented earlier also acknowledges that there is a serious impact of the GST on northern tourism in a whole host of ways. There will be taxes now on bus, rail and water travel, and people will be even further discouraged by the sheer cost from travelling through the distances of northern Ontario.

It is also shocking, if I understand the GST proposals correctly, that the GST seems to apply to air travel within Canada but not to air travel outside Canada. So what happens to northern tourism, not to mention national understanding, when people are encouraged not to travel in Canada, when there are extra costs on the already prohibitive charges just to reach the northern part of our province or our country? Incidentally, I think that the Speaker should recognize that there will also be significant

increases in transportation costs for the Legislative Assembly when the GST is imposed on air fares.

I would like to ask the government: If the GST is indeed then to be a reality, what can be done immediately to make travel in northern Ontario more reasonable so that tourism in the northern part of our province can become viable? Perhaps as a start I might suggest to the Minister of Revenue and to her colleague the Minister of Energy that they might look at how they think they could equalize gas prices across the province.

All of us know it is a reality that people in northern Ontario pay on average four cents a litre more for their gasoline. People also happen to travel much greater distances by the very fact of the geography of northern Ontario. So they are travelling greater distances, they are spending more as a result of their distances, and it costs them more per kilometre to do it.

The report that was presented also says that the impact of the GST is going to be significant on the provision of health care and education in our northern communities. The reason for this is because the rebate that is going to be given to education and health institutions and municipalities is going to be based on a national average, and that average is not going to take into account the original additional costs of providing services in northern communities.

I have to tell the members of this House, as a northerner, that this kind of additional cost comes at a time when we are finally beginning to make some slow but steady progress in providing increased access to health and to educational services in the northern parts of this province. So I have to ask again: If the GST is to be a reality, if we are going to face these increased charges, if we are going to experience this kind of setback, what can the government do to offset that further disadvantage for the north?

Let me ask whether or not they would consider looking at increases in the operating costs, the northern operating grants that are paid to school boards, municipalities, universities and colleges, so that they can begin to deal with this increased cost that the GST will mean.

Finally, there is a differential impact of the GST, the first ever tax on electricity. Again, it hurts most in the north where electricity use is inevitably higher. So again, if the GST is to be real, may I ask the government what it can do about this added burden. I suggest to the Minister of Revenue, and again through her to the Minister of Energy, that one of the things in this regard that they might do, and how they might be able to give the north a break, is to look very closely at something called time-of-use rates. Please do not continue to penalize northern Ontario in the name of conservation, when it is in fact impossible for northern Ontarians to reduce their energy use past the essential level in wintertime when they are paying higher rates.

I would just like to conclude by referring directly to the statement that was made by the Minister of Northern Development earlier this week. If I may quote her citing the report, she says:

"The report further states that the impact of the GST on the costs of transportation, energy and housing in the north

will be felt by every northern resident. The expenditures for transportation and energy are higher in the north and they will become more costly as a result of the GST.

"The report recommends that GST credits for institutions, new home buyers and low-income families in the north be adjusted to reflect the higher northern costs. It also suggests reducing excise and transportation related taxes in order to offset higher heating and transportation costs in the north."

We appreciate the report, which recognizes the pending reality of the impact of the GST, but the government should please not just tell us what the problems are; the government should look at what it can do directly to offset some of these problems.

1650

The report goes on to state that communities which are very isolated lack essential services and have difficulty recruiting labour, especially teachers and health care professionals, and would lose approximately \$20 million annually. This suggests that the provinces should be further consulted in order to establish more equitable boundaries and that those communities losing tax credits be compensated with more economic development assistance.

Again, we could not agree more in northern Ontario. May I please ask the government to look again at the hardships that are to be created, as we recognize the reality of the pending GST, and take those steps to provide the economic development assistance.

The minister's statement concluded by saying:

"I want to emphasize that the GST on its own is the wrong tax at the wrong time for northern Ontarians and that the GST, combined with other insensitive federal measures, is absolutely unacceptable to this government.

"This federal tax grab is being imposed on a region whose residents can least afford a reduction in their take-home income. We will continue to voice our opposition to this destructive federal initiative."

We agree wholeheartedly with those comments. We only ask that some very specific actions be taken. The government should do something about it.

Mr Callahan: I rise to speak to this issue because, when I was listening to the minister responsible explaining in the House how simple it was, I did not understand a word he was saying. We could attribute that to one of two things: Either I am simple, and I would not take a vote on that at the moment, or in the alternative the legislation or the change in the taxation that is being suggested is not going to be quite as simple as he thinks it is going to be.

If members look at the act itself, section 2 is really the nuts and bolts of it. It says that every person shall pay tax on the fair market value of goods and the consumption of goods. But when you go into the definition area of that I challenge a retailer, who will probably pull his hair out when he is trying to do this, to try to put value on things like the transfer of shares from an individual or a corporation to an individual. How do you arrive at a value? How do you determine how you are going to deal with that from a taxation standpoint?

That is just one example, but I think that if any person goes through the act in a meaningful way, he is going to find that this particular piece of legislation, which is heralded in *An Agenda for People* and is being heralded today by the government as a tax saving for the taxpayer, either does not understand—I would like to be charitable and say they do not understand what they are saying—or in the alternative it is the usual order of the day, smoke and mirrors. Instead of being up front with taxpayers and saying, “We’re going to save you money in some of the things that I’ll suggest to you,” what they do is try to give them some idea that they are going to save the people money by creating this parallel system.

Let’s face it: When a retailer has to add expense to his business because of getting a computer or a new cash register or whatever, another accountant, another set of books, whatever it is, or even his time, that in fact is reflected in the price of the product. Members can be sure that what will happen is that the retailers will include this in the additional cost of their product. We all saw this when we went metric. The price of things went up when we went metric because people found they had to convert to the metric measurements, the metric rules. These were all costs that were involved.

Let me say to members what I think might have been done in a better way and not be smoke and mirrors. We all know that the recession we are in is not a recession, that it is a depression and is probably going to be with us—the Conference Board of Canada last night reported 18 months. The president of the National Bank of Canada said it was going to be 18 months. I would suggest it is probably going to be more in the range of twice that. If that is the case, then what we should be doing as politicians, if we are truly representing the people of this province, is ensuring that we find areas where we can save them money.

I raised the most significant aspect of that as the subject matter of one of my questions in the House: the price of gasoline. The Premier’s promise of 10 August, during the election, in the heat of the election, was that he was going to champion the cause to make certain that the oil companies were not taking undue advantage of the Kuwait crisis to secure profits in excess of what they were entitled to.

We have heard question after question in this House to the Minister of Energy and she seems to indicate that there is no problem. We have not heard one thing about how this is going to be monitored. We have not heard of one mechanism or technique that this government is going to use to try to ensure that the oil companies are not gouging.

Let me say this: It does not take a great deal of talent or ingenuity, as you drive around the province, to realize that everybody is up on their ladders at the same time changing the price. The prices have escalated. The price of oil has come down by \$3, as reported on CFTO last night.

Mr Bradley: We’re still paying more for gas, though.

Mr Callahan: That is right, yes.

Mr Bradley: Still paying more.

Mr Callahan: Sure you are; of course.

Mr Bradley: I thought Bob was going stop the gouging.

Mr Callahan: The Premier has not found the white horse to ride on to lead the charge against either that or the GST. But I suggest to members that is a real, honest approach to helping people who are going to be or right now are in significant difficulty. I think the time and the place and the nature of the recession we are in does not allow us to stand in this House and do the traditional things of the past, the political magic, the political smoke and mirrors. That is all it is, really, political smoke and mirrors.

Why does the government not have the guts to do one of two things? The gas thing: Get at it. Find out whether they are gouging people. I was interested in the Minister of Energy’s answer to my question, or perhaps it was one of the other members. She said: “Well, just turn down the thermostat. Turn down the thermostat and don’t drive as often, and put on a sweater.” That is reminiscent of something I recall about 15 years ago from the third party, by a minister of the crown for the Conservatives. I cannot remember his name. I think it was—help me out. What was his name? In any event, that was the type of answer we got from the Conservative Minister of Energy.

Mr Bradley: It was the former Treasurer of Ontario, John White.

Mr Callahan: John White; that is right.

Let’s look at it this way as well. I have run in a number of elections, some successful, some unsuccessful, and I always recall that the NDP had a slogan which was catchy. It was really catchy. It was: “Let the rich pay. Make the rich pay.”

Mr Bradley: Make the rich pay. That was Marxist-Leninist, not the NDP.

Mr Callahan: Right.

Recognize this fact, and I would like to take the members through this: They are not going to make the rich pay here. Think about it. With this double taxation or this parallel accord that they are using in terms of the taxation, they are going to reward the people who buy the big ticket items. They are the people who will be rewarded. They will be rewarded at the detriment of the people who need the money the most, the programs, the benefits, the government looking after their interests.

They have taken \$500 million out of the provincial coffers at a time when that is unacceptable, when people are losing their homes, when people are losing their jobs. They have done it because in their *Agenda for People* they considered that is what won them the election, so it is a pure political ploy.

If it was not a pure political ploy, then they would have ventured into the field of tobacco. I know that is a dirty word these days, but there are still some of us smokers around. There still are agricultural people who make their livings out of raising tobacco, and yet if you look at the act, the value for tobacco includes the tax. So even if they have this parallel system, they are differentiating between tobacco and the other services.

1700

I suggest that some bright person who likes to smoke and perhaps feels that this is inequitable is going to take this piece of legislation probably as far as the Supreme Court of Canada, and members will find that it is contrary to the Charter of Rights. I would suggest that if they are going to make one rule, it had better be for everybody or their legislation will have no effect and will be declared unconstitutional. I suggest that there are areas in this province where moneys can be obtained—I should not give them these ideas, because they will probably try to use them. But I feel so concerned about the constituents in my riding, as I think every one of the members is duty-bound to think about the constituents in his or her riding, that in this particular recession we should be sharing these ideas.

Take lotteries. In the United States, when a lottery is won by a lottery holder, that person does not get the money. First of all, the government takes 30% of that lottery winning, which goes back into the coffers. The second thing they do is they buy an annuity for that person, and that is all that person gets. All the capital goes into the coffers. Now, you would not believe it in the United States, because I do not know what they have been doing with all that extra money they rip off in this way.

I think that in this province, perhaps at the unhappiness of one person who was the recipient of that \$4-million, \$12-million or \$15-million windfall, the government could have relieved him of some of that by way of tax and affected only one person to the benefit of the balance of the 8 million or 9 million Ontarians who would benefit from that. Some people may say that would interfere with lottery sales. I suggest to members it does not interfere with lottery sales in the United States. They are just as effective and just as successful in terms of dealing with the lottery.

Instead of doing that, what does this government do? It ignores looking into the question of whether or not the oil companies are gouging constituents.

Mr Bradley: They must be looking into it because Bob Rae said they were going to.

Mr Callahan: Oh, is that right? Well, he did on 10 August.

Mr Bradley: He said, "I will not allow anyone to gouge."

Mr Callahan: Well, he has not looked into it thus far. What he does is he resorts to the alternative in Bill 1. I am back on track. He resorts to the effort of Bill 1, which I suggest to members is a very sneaky way to try to gain political points, but at the same time empty the coffers of the Treasurer so that he will have to cut back on some programs.

One of my colleagues here said that the former Treasurer told her there are three ways you deal with taxes: You either raise them, find other sources of revenue or cut programs. That is the reality of government; that is the reality of the members' responsibility over there. They are governing at a very serious time in the history of this province, a very serious time in the history of this country.

I always thought the New Democratic Party, and I believe this, cared about people. Yet those guys over there, and gals, are doing exactly what Brian Mulroney is doing in Ottawa, at the wrong time. He is bringing in the GST, and they are embracing his GST. They have to be embracing it because they are bringing in legislation to parallel it. They would not bring in legislation to parallel something that they did not embrace. So their government in fact embraces the GST. Let's come clean now. They embrace the GST. They are in favour of it. They are really federal Conservatives in orange ties or whatever. So, fess up. The people out there know that this is the situation. Okay?

The thing that frightens me about this whole issue is that as members know, Mr Mulroney has decided to tax everything that walks, moves, breathes or whatever. Right now this bill, if you look at it in terms of the existing Retail Sales Tax Act, only taxes certain things—candy bars and so on. It does not tax the full gamut.

But this is the question I have to ask myself, particularly in light of the three ways of raising money to run this province that were related by my colleague, that you either raise taxes, cut programs or find other sources of revenue: Is the the secret agenda for people the one that the government did not advertise during the election? Is the secret agenda for people to parallel the GST now, and then to expand the retail sales tax to cover all the items the GST covers so that what you now have is a 15%, across-the-board tax on everything that moves, walks, breathes, talks, is edible, is tasty and is nice, and brings great revenue into the coffers of the provincial Legislature?

Backbenchers opposite may not know about this yet, because this is what happens in the bowels of cabinet. How would they like to be a fly on the wall as they are discussing enlarging the taxation field to cover all of the items that Brian Mulroney is about to cover—and is about to destroy this country, I would say as well—and perhaps to join in with that raid on the money that is left in the hands of these people?

It is hard to tell whether it is or is not the plan. We have asked questions about the government's Agenda for People, which it used to seduce the electorate into a sense of false security to get elected. Now, every day when it is asked about the Agenda for People in the House, it is: "Well, we're not going to do it now. We're going to do it later." It is reminiscent of statements that were made in this House about, "When will it be done?" The word was, "In the fullness of time."

Hon Mr Cooke: Early fall.

Mr Callahan: Yes, early fall. So in fact is that the plan of the new NDP government? Is that what they are going to do? Is the tax grab on? Are they going to start taxing everything that moves? I suggest that is a real possibility. Even if my good friend the Treasurer has not thought about it yet, he will be required to do that, because this recession is going to create demands beyond his wildest dreams. We are already seeing it. He has things such as the refugees, who are looked after under general welfare and municipalities, particularly in my riding where we are close to the airport. Staggering amounts. There has

to be a rethinking and a renegotiation of the arrangement of who pays what. Those will be demands.

The government's leader, the Premier, was out in my riding in Huttonville. Very dramatic: While he was there, a portable happened to arrive on the scene. I do not whether it got there by mistake, good luck or good planning. For the years that the third party, the Conservatives, were in office out in my riding, as in other ridings, they never built anything. They always put it off, put it aside. As a result of that, the school situation in my riding, as in other ridings, has become absolutely horrendous. In fact, we used to say that PC stood for either "portable classroom" or Progressive Conservative.

In any event, I want to get back to the Premier, who came out to Huttonville and went through this extremely dramatic event—there happened to be a television camera there too, which was amazing—where the portable was taken off the truck. He made this tremendous speech. I even applauded it. I thought it was excellent that we are going to get rid of the portables. Well, well, well. Will the government tell me what plans are in the hopper to get rid of the portables, or even to look down the line towards dealing with the portables? Nothing. In fact, that is an absolutely critical issue, which is going to require money.

1710

I am back to Bill 1. If they give up the money under this Bill 1, they have in fact depleted the Treasury by \$500 million. Think what they could do with \$500 million. They could perhaps eliminate a great number of these portables; they could do a number of other things that would help people. Instead, they are giving it away.

I recognize that the alternative I suggested in terms of lotteries or looking into the question of whether our gas prices are being gouged, and also one that was suggested by my leader now and the then Premier of the province in terms of reducing the retail sales tax by one percentage point—

Mr Christopherson: Are you for it or against it?

Mr Callahan: Haven't you caught on yet? I will talk slowly so you do catch on.

If they want to be honest with the electorate and avoid the smoke-and-mirror junk—really, during the last election I think in a real sense people were trying to say: "We don't like the politics of the past. We want people to be upfront with us." If that is the case, rather than doing this underhanded approach of paralleling the tax, why not be upfront? Why not say, "We'll reduce the sales tax by 1%, from 8% to 7%"?

They might say, "Well, if we do that, we are losing more than \$500 million in taxes." At the outset, yes, but what that is doing is stimulating the economy, putting more money back into the hands of consumers to buy products and therefore increasing jobs, and we need those things.

I see some smiles on faces over there. This is not a smiling matter, because we are in the midst of probably the most significant depression short of what took place back in the days when I was just knee-high to a grasshopper. But the thing that saves us, and the reason it does not look

that bad, is that we do have safety nets in place, we do have things we can fall back on, but you cannot fall back on those things unless you have the money to support them.

The \$500 million would help significantly, although it might be just a drop in the bucket in the health expenditures of this province. I suspect that maybe the way they are going to eliminate this is that there will be some sort of deductible or a charge. I will go back to Bill 1, because in essence that is what happens when you reduce the income of the province. To the average person out there watching this—assuming there are any people watching it; they are probably into the Young and the Restless by now—\$500 million is a lot of money. I think the problem we have down here is that because we have heard figures of billions, we fail to recognize that in fact \$500 million is an awful lot of money and could do an awful lot of good in this province if it were in the coffers of the province.

I suppose by my speaking this way I am taking the chance that people out there who think they are going to get a tax break are going to be upset because I am arguing against their getting the tax break, but in fact what I am trying to do is say to my constituents and to other people who might be interested that the old game of politics is over. It has to be over: You cannot fool the people any more, you have to be upfront with them. I think it is very important that they recognize that this so-called paralleling is only a precursor to what is going to happen down the line, as I suggested. Perhaps all of the products, just as under the GST, are going to be taxed totally.

That being the case, the government would not want to do that right away because it recognizes that the federal Conservative Party is going to go down the sluice over this GST. So they do not want to do that right now. What they are going to do is bring this bill in and pass it; that will be the first one. Then somewhere down the line, after the Prime Minister and his party have gone to the polls and been decimated, then the Treasurer will rub his hands together and say: "Well, we're into a deeper recession. We need money." He has a couple of options.

I see, my time is up. In any event, I want to give other people an opportunity to participate in this debate. The Conservatives, the third party, will definitely want to participate, because then we can ask them questions about what is happening in Ottawa.

I want to say in closing, in all seriousness, to keep in mind the very fact that that \$500 million the government is losing has to be recouped somehow. I suppose the Treasurer could take up a collection of his—how many members does the government have over there, 85? Work that out, how much they would have to pay.

An hon member: Whoa, whoa, whoa: 74.

Mr Callahan: There are 74? Figure out how much it is going to cost the members if he puts the tap on them. Or if they are sensible and really care about the people they represent in a very trying time—I am sure there are even some of us in this House who can remember the Great Depression—they recognize that that money has to be recouped and recognize that they are taking programs

away from people or taking money out of their pockets if they have to increase taxes, and they can get the Minister of Energy on to her white horse and get her to look into the question of whether we are being gouged by the oil companies. That affects the working man who has to drive a truck, has to drive his car from employment to home. It affects the housewife who has to shop. It has an impact on everything. I surely expect that will be looked at. If it is not, if that issue is not looked at, I pledge to the members that at least once a week I am going to ask the Minister of Energy and the Premier what they have done about it, particularly if the price rises.

Mr White: The member for Brampton South made a point about—

Mr Stockwell: Well, an hour ago.

Mr White: I did hear it; it was earlier on. He was asking about what the secret Agenda for People was. The members in the official opposition have been waving that particular agenda about, and it struck me that there was nothing particularly secret about it. It was certainly open for public consumption, for the members opposite to read, share, become convinced by. Obviously, they have been. The only thing perhaps secret about it is that this government has every intention of fulfilling its obligations that it made to the people of Ontario. The only thing that is secret about it is the divergence between that and what the member opposite has had as his experience. I know he has ably represented the constituents of his riding for many years, not always to the favour of the government he was representing; I know he has struggled to do so because of the government he was representing. The secret here, the only secret, is that there is no secret, that this bill represents this agenda and we will stick to it.

1720

Ms Churley: I will be very brief. I just wanted to point out to the member for Brampton South, who made a comment, "What about the working man?" and then, "What about the working man who has a wife and family to support at home?" that I take great exception to that. Earlier today we had a conversation in this House about equality between men and women and that the answer is in changing our attitudes. I am sure the member did not mean to imply that he does not know there are working women, but one of the ways we are going to be able to do that is by starting in this House and being very careful that we treat women and men equally and recognize that there are working women as well who are out there struggling to supply an income for their families.

Mr Callahan: I would like to deal with the last issue first. I was getting a note from my whip that he had turned into a hook. I recognize that there are women out there who are working, and many of them single parents that we should be supporting in terms of providing housing for them, particularly young single parents so they have a real choice in terms of keeping their child or not; the member might pass that on to her Minister of Health. But I do recognize the fact that there are both men and women out there who are earning the bread for their children. Anything else was not intended. I would not intend that.

Mr Stockwell: What about the secret?

Mr Callahan: The secret? I suppose the secret will become a non-secret when in fact it happens, but I still suggest the government has to—

Mr Charlton: Does that mean if it never happens it will be a secret for ever?

Mr Callahan: It will be like the Agenda for People if it never happens, which it probably will not. The secret, I suspect, may be a very large possibility, and I think the people out there today have heard it first in the Legislature on 6 December and may hear about it on 6 December 1991 or 1992, but it is going to happen, because we are in a serious recession. It is getting worse every day and the government is going to need all those safety nets to look after the people who are less advantaged in this province.

In closing, I suggest that what the government has done by this parallel taxation is reward the people who buy the big-ticket items; they are the people who are going to get the benefit from this, not the poor people, the people we should all care about, the people who cannot look after themselves. I suggest that before government members vote on this bill they think about that.

Mr Sola: I am glad to participate in this debate on Bill 1. I think most of the critical items have been expressed time and again, but it grates on my nerves when the party in power still keeps insisting that Bill 1 is a tax revolt. A revolt is something that takes violent action. Some of the government members have claimed they are taking an action through the courts. Very few revolts that I can recall can be classified as legal revolts.

I want to go back to the Agenda for People, which was created during the election and which acknowledged the existence of a recession. Yet now, every measure the government takes or attempts to take it explains away with the fact that we are in the throes of a recession. They have to study and re-study the instant solutions they themselves came up with. They are not studying measures that either the Conservative Party initiated or the Liberal Party initiated. They are studying solutions proposed by themselves during the election, in acknowledgement of the existence of a recession.

Interestingly, when they studied measures the Liberal Party, the previous government, had introduced in the previous session, the studies were quite short and legislation was reintroduced in a short time. Yet the measures they had proposed are taking so much longer to study. What was it about those measures that takes so long? Were those solutions instant solutions with no fact behind them? Were they solutions that were like a balloon, all full of hot air and one little pinprick and they explode into nothing? When I look at it, their credibility is really suffering.

I just want to hark back to some of the other promises they had made or criticisms they had made of the previous government.

I have here a headline from the Toronto Star which says, "Rae Lets British Gas Buy Company," and then the first statement says, "in a policy flip-flop." Somewhere later on in the article it says: "When he was leader of the opposition, Rae indicated he would kill the deal if he were

Premier. 'We think it should be a public utility, publicly owned.'" He comes into power and he makes a good deal; flip-flops.

The Toronto Sun, on the same thing, said, "Rae's election challenge to then Premier David Peterson was to put his money where his mouth was." Yet when Premier Rae is in Premier Peterson's shoes, his mouth was certainly not where his money was.

Take a look at some of the other things they had promised previously. For instance, on waste management, they dumped on the previous government for going to a lax environmental review process, according to them. Then in comes their former critic, who must be green with envy at the previous minister's actions in that portfolio, and what does she do? She removes any criteria whatsoever. She brings in policy by decree: It will be her opinion that counts and nothing else. The timetable for implementing any of her policy is so short that it is obvious to everyone she will have to circumvent all of the protections we have for the public. There is yet another flip-flop.

During the election they also promised to do much more for the poor. I think a figure of \$300 million was proposed, and this is in the Agenda for People during the election acknowledging a recession. The minister comes in here and gives \$91 million. We applaud that, we recommend that, we agree with that, but again it is not fulfilling the expectations raised before the election and during the election. I am saying their credibility is dropping with every step they take back from the promises they had made, from the guarantees they had made to the people.

We hear consistently that they represent the common people, the average people, the people who have never been in power. Well, if they do represent them, they certainly will not represent them very much longer, because the people are starting to lose faith because they are stepping back from the promises made.

They keep throwing back at the Liberal Party the challenge or promise the previous Premier had made about fighting free trade. Yet when I take a look at this tax revolt, I can see quite a few similarities. I would like to say as well that I hope the results are the same, because the impression, according to them, was that we as a province were going to destroy free trade. They promised to destroy the GST if they came to power.

1730

Mr Bradley: And free trade.

Mr Sola: And free trade and everything else.

The impression was in the minds of the people, and we know the results. On 6 September we went from 93 seats to 36 seats. I hope that with the measures they are taking with the retreat from all their promises, the people will judge them with their own criteria and judge them just as harshly as they have judged us and that after the next election the results will be the same. Where we went from 93 to 36, proportionately they should go from 74 to about 26.

That is something they should keep in mind, because I think the people are very much aware of what is going on

now. They will no longer take unfulfilled promises and return the same government. They expect that promises made during the election will be kept. This may sound like sour grapes, but the problem is they got to that side of the House because they made the promises during the election, fully aware that we were in the throes of a recession. Therefore, they cannot use the recession as an excuse that they cannot fulfil those commitments.

Those were instant solutions for problems during the election. They were not five-year solutions as they are today, and not only five-year solutions today, but five-year potential solutions, because the Premier is waffling even more in saying they may not even be able to do it during their first term in office, which I hope will be their last.

I would like to check with my whip if—

Mr Mahoney: It is a hook.

Mr Sola: It is a hook? Okay. I will not take as long as the previous speaker.

I would like to thank the members for putting up with my five minutes, but I would like to leave with this: The government made the promises. They were their words, they were not our words. Therefore, it is up to them to keep the commitment.

Mr Kwinter: I was waiting for some comments from the government side. I am delighted to participate in the debate. Over the last two days, I have been listening to it with great interest and I noticed an attitude that seems to permeate the debate. I just want to throw out a gratuitous comment initially, and that is that everybody in this House is really a relatively ordinary person put into a rather extraordinary situation.

There was nothing magical about 6 September, other than the placing of the chairs. There are some people on that side and some people on this side, and there is not automatically instant wisdom that descended on one side and total ignorance that descended on another on that date. It did not happen. If the members think that, because they are there, suddenly they have this great, omnipotent kind of vision of what should be happening, they are really living in a dream world. The wisdom does not rest there, it does not necessarily rest here; it rests wherever we can find it.

It is interesting; years ago, before I got elected, I was talking to a rather prominent politician and he said to me, "Monte, remember one thing: The other side has generals and they have people just like you do, and don't ever get sucked into the situation where you think that you have all of the answers."

I want to talk about parallelism, not so much what is in Bill 1, but the parallel between the free trade debate and the debate that we have now on the GST. At the time, the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, would stand up almost daily and really berate the government for its lack of activity, its lack of action in doing something about free trade. It was very much like a person who says: "You go out and fight them and I will hold your coat. I'm not going to do anything about it, but you go out and do it." Every day, we would get that. We now are in a position

with the GST where not only is the Premier not holding anyone's coat, he has not even taken off his jacket.

I want to tell members that we have been alluding to the promise, but to my knowledge, and I have not heard every single part of the debate, I do not think anyone has quoted verbatim what the Premier said. I want to put that into the record.

This was on 17 August and it was quoted in the Thunder Bay Times-News. This is a quote from the Premier: "'An Ontario NDP government would lead a country-wide revolt against Ottawa's proposed goods and services tax,' leader Bob Rae said Thursday." I think the operative word is "lead." He would lead a country-wide revolt. "'Ontario should be leading a national revolt against the GST,' he said outside a downtown railway station. 'Ontario should be the one taking the lead in terms of fighting the GST.'" He also went on to say that he would rally the premiers of the other nine provinces to join him in making the GST the shortest-lived tax in Canadian history.

Yesterday the member for Oxford stood up and defended the position of his party and his government, saying: "We have taken a great step in this revolt. We have joined in a legal challenge." Now I suggest to members that—

Mr Sutherland: It was more of a start than you guys.

Mr Kwinter: Well, let me say that I would suggest that any fair-minded person looking at the situation would have a very difficult time trying to equate the joining of a legal challenge with the rhetoric of the then Leader of the Opposition, and now Premier, that was made on 17 August.

I want to talk briefly about the GST and the problem that we have. The GST has another parallel. When I was debating against free trade—and I did this on a regular basis across this province and in fact in other jurisdictions—I had a saying that I started out with at every meeting. I did a paraphrase of a statement that Winston Churchill made. At one time he had said—my paraphrase of it and why I want to relate it to both free trade and the GST—that never in the history of human endeavour had so little been known by so many about so much.

What is happening is that when you are out there talking to people, 80% of the people indicate that they are opposed to the GST. I say that I think that they should be. But the problem that we have is that it is another policy that had as its genesis a good idea. I think economists will look at the GST in its pure sense and say the idea of distributing tax across a broader base is a good idea.

We had a situation where the Minister of Finance stated at the time that he was going to bring this forward. It was going to make us more competitive. It was going to do all kinds of wonderful things for this country, and in his opinion, he was going to bring forward a GST of 9%. Economists across this country looked at his proposal, took a look at the 9% and said, "This is nothing but a tax grab."

As part of the selling of this particular initiative, the idea was supposed to be that this would be revenue-neutral. I am sure all members will know that at present in

Canada we have a 13.5% federal sales tax that is really buried in a lot of the things that we buy. What they were proposing was to take that 13.5% out and add a 9% GST at the consumer level, but the net revenue to the government would be neutral.

Again, economists evaluated, did their calculations and said: "That is absurd. The proper number should probably be somewhere around 6%." I should tell members that the Minister of Finance was adamant. This was the number, this was the right number and this was the number they were going to go forward with. The uprising, the uproar that accompanied that allowed the government to back-track and it now came in with its 7% tax.

1740

My concern about Bill 1 is that the government has addressed one issue. That issue is the piggybacking of the provincial sales tax on to the GST. But they have not addressed a host of other issues, and there are many of them. The impact of the GST will be pervasive. I think that is the mildest term I could use. With few exceptions, a 7% tax will be imposed on all goods and services consumed in Canada. It will apply to the value added at every stage in the chain.

By the federal government's own estimates, well over one million businesses and organizations in both the private and public sector will have to account for the GST. If you compare that to the present time, when only 75,000 individuals are responsible for remitting under the federal sales tax, it is going from 75,000 to one million-plus, with all of the paraphernalia, all of the forms, all of the minutiae that go with remitting all of this. That is going to create an incredible hardship, particularly on small business individuals.

Let me just list for members the groups that are going to be impacted by this: We are going to have every individual, every partnership, every corporation, every trust, every estate, every society, every union, every club, every association, every organization or other body that is carrying on any commercial activity being required to register and to remit tax on its transactions. Despite assurances by the federal government that this would be a simple tax to administer, its application is going to be very complex.

One of the things that I find has escaped most of the attention of the government—I am talking now of the provincial government—is that notwithstanding that the GST is supposed to be revenue-neutral, it will not be economically neutral. What is going to happen? I notice the Minister of Housing is nodding his head. He is going to find that he is going to be involved in problems because of GST.

There are three classifications of people: There are some people who do not pay tax, some people who do but, generally speaking, people who rent will not pay the GST. Most tenants breathe a sigh of relief. But what is not apparent to most people is that the landlords are not allowed to collect tax but they are not exempted from paying tax, which means every time they buy cleaning supplies or whatever it is they are buying, every time they pay services in that building, they will be subject to GST, which means the minister's proposed Bill 4, where he is allowing for expenses that are beyond the control of the landlord, will pass that through as an expense recoverable from the tenants. That is going to happen throughout our economy.

There are going to be lots of services that are provided where there is no GST but the prices are going to go up. The people are not charging the GST and as a result they do not collect it, but they will be paying it. There was no mention of this in any of the legislation that has come forward, no addressing of this by the government. There is no one looking at what is happening. The only thing that has happened is that the Treasurer's economic statement has predicted that the rate of inflation in 1992 will reach 6.1%. The Conference Board of Canada and other institutions have looked at it and they feel it may go as high as 6.3%.

What that is going to do is it is going to automatically impact on labour negotiations, because everybody who is going to be impacted by a higher rate of inflation because of his COLA clauses is going to say, "We want more." The expectations are going to be there. There is going to be an increase in economic pressure, and suddenly we have ourselves in a situation that is the direct reverse of what the intent of the federal government was, and that is to lower inflation.

So just by the GST, it is going to increase it. There is going to be a multiplier effect and, as a result, we are going to find that not only are we not going to be a real beneficiary—and I want to hasten to say that some sectors of the economy will benefit. Exporters for sure will benefit. But, and I have said this publicly before, the government's policies, where it thinks it is doing the right thing, have really become a situation where the cure is worse than the ailment.

It is something that we collectively have got to address. It is not good enough to sit on one side or the other and say, "What did you do about it?" or, "Why haven't you done something about it?" We collectively have got to address it. We have got to get to the point where we maintain our competitive position.

I am not happy about the stories I see in the press, whether they are attributed properly or not. When I see a story in the media that Imperial Oil is saying, "We're going to leave Ontario," and when I see the irresponsible, stupid ads that are placed in the Wall Street Journal, it does not give me any comfort to say, "Those guys are stupid" and "That isn't what the guy said."

Out there, there is that message. People are looking at it. With all due respect to the Minister of Energy, she said today that she got a letter saying that was not quite what they said, but there will be very few people who will hear that. What they will see is an article in a paper that has the largest circulation in Canada that says Imperial Oil is thinking of going, and people say, "Oh, my God, we can't invest there."

Again, I am talking collectively. This is not a partisan issue. It is an issue where we have to address it without a partisan sort of leaning to it. We have to make sure that we remain competitive. If we do not remain competitive, we are going to have a serious problem.

Mr Speaker, I had planned to speak at greater length, but many of my colleagues are anxious to participate. So at that point, I will say thank you.

Mrs Sullivan: I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill 1, which is being put forward by a government which says it opposes the GST and will lead a crusade against the GST, but whose very first action in relationship to the GST is to introduce a bill which provides harmonization with the GST.

That tells us that the government has accepted the goods and services tax as a fait accompli, a given, and that is frankly what this bill is about. If members accept that, we must accept their logic and move on from there, but understand that logic. We must ask how the government has championed its own people.

For instance, on the day after she was sworn in as minister, did the Minister of Revenue get on the phone with the federal Minister of National Revenue, the Honourable Otto Jelinek, and discuss this issue with him? Did she get him on the line and tell him what the needs of Ontario were in relationship to the GST? Did she request a meeting? No. Did she hound him in his constituency office? No.

1750

Her decision to proceed with Bill 1 is an unusual decision in comparison to the other kinds of action we have seen in that she made a decision. We have not seen many other decisions coming out of this government. But we want to know if in making that decision she spoke up for Ontarians when she was coming to her conclusions.

I would like to backtrack a little bit about the GST. It is a value added tax, we know, a tax that will apply to most goods and services sold in the country, collected at each stage as goods and services pass through the sequential stages of the production and distribution system. The federal government introduced that tax, according to Michael Wilson, to replace an unfair manufacturers sales tax, a tax that meant that our products were uncompetitive when they were being placed, through export, in international markets. The manufacturers sales tax also penalized investment and capital expansion and the purchase of capital goods by our industries.

There were alternatives to a goods and services tax. Michael Wilson chose not to accept them. Instead, he has chosen a goods and services tax which is regressive, which is arbitrary, which is mean-spirited. It is based on faulty economics. It is a tax that will cause significant inflation. It is estimated that inflation will be up 2.25% next year. It is a tax that will remove purchasing power from consumers. It is a tax that will cause serious dislocation for our small businesses and it is a tax that will harm our low-income earners in a very significant way.

Now we have Bill 1 before us, a bill that says there is no fight left because this government is going to harmonize with the GST. This bill does two things. First, it legislates a policy decision relating to the point of collection of the provincial sales tax. It says that the retail sales tax provincially will kick in on the before-tax value of a product rather than on the after-tax value of a product. That decision will cost the provincial Treasury \$500 million annually starting in January, when there is

no new revenue base, and going when there is no new revenue base for a full quarter of the fiscal year. That money will have to be made up somewhere else. We know that there are only three alternatives for that money to be made up: through upward adjustments in other taxation, through borrowing or through decreases in service.

The impact on the 1991 budget will be significantly higher in 1990 in fiscal planning terms. I can tell members that the Deputy Minister of Revenue was at one time budget chief in this province, and he understands these issues very, very well.

The Treasurer, the member for Nickel Belt, is a charming man, a tough man. He was a very fair committee chairman. He is going to have to make extremely tough decisions as a result of the decision made by the Minister of Revenue. I will tell the members on the backbench who did not participate in making that decision that they are going to have to go back to their communities—to Victoria-Haliburton and to Oxford and to other places in this riding—and they are going to have to explain to people why, because of a policy decision, there is not \$500 million left in the kitty for schools, for roads and transit, for sewers, for environmental protection and for more Ontario Public Service Employees Union positions. I want to tell members that they will discover that those are the realities of political decision-making in this place.

The second part of this bill relates to the technical compliance. It does not simplify the issue, and in fact for a collector of the tax, it may well make things more difficult and more costly to administer. Those compliance costs will be significant in every sector and in every enterprise. I tell members that bookkeeping procedures will have to be adjusted first for the GST and now for the revised application of the retail sales tax.

This is a conundrum for the collector, who is an agent of the federal government and an agent of the provincial government. Federally, the concept of supply is at the root of the GST system. The amount of the tax to be paid and the eligibility for the input tax credits depends on whether the supply is taxable, zero-rated or exempt from GST provisions. Provincially, the final sale price on products is now included in the base, subject to the retail sales tax. Under this bill it will not be the final sale price; it will be the second to the final sale price.

The complications, I tell members, will be horrendous for vendors, for government and for auditors. What the government thought it was giving away, the \$500 million of retail sales tax savings, in fact will be more than accounted for in the delivery costs for the people who will be collecting this tax on its behalf, and there are close to 250,000 of them in Ontario today.

I think of a bookshop that may have to look at a situation like this where books, unless they are religious, are subject to the GST but not subject to the retail sales tax; bound magazines and periodicals subject to the GST and the retail sales tax; newspapers, no GST, no RST; cards, a GST and an RST. What will happen is that for every one of those transactions there will have to be a different input, a different accounting mechanism.

I look at the corner grocery store. We all have them in our communities. We know that most of them are operated by small business people. The corner store may sell food. It may sell candy. It may sell toilet paper. It may sell a number of a broad base of products. One of the things that it will probably sell is soft drinks in refillable containers. We know that when we buy that kind of soft drink, we pay the retail sales tax when we purchase it. Under the federal laws there will be a new GST payment required, but when that bottle is returned, imagine this: The vendor can reclaim a GST notional input tax credit of 7/107 of the amount refunded to the customer. Can members imagine the headaches, the gnashing of teeth of the person who is subject to that structure? This does not affect only the retail sector and I hope the minister is very well aware of these issues.

I want to refer to another area where there is significant disruption as a result of the tumbling and paralleling of this tax. The GST is not only something that is going to affect our businesses, our industries, but it is going to be something that will have a huge impact on our municipalities and our institutions.

I would like to read a clipping from the Oakville Beaver, which is a newspaper published in my community, quoting the town treasurer, who says about the GST:

"The major concern that we have is that the municipal sector is the most complicated sector when it comes to the GST because we have more categories to deal with than does a manufacturer. Some of our services are tax exempt, some of them are taxable and some of them are taxable and rebatable. For example, the town will have to charge GST on recreational programs for children 15 and over, while programs for kids under 15 will be GST exempt. What happens if you run a program for kids from 12 to 20? Is that taxable or not taxable? Or what happens if you have two groups using the same services in the same facility at the same time? Do you charge tax and how much do you charge?"

There are all kinds of interesting little problems. Those kinds of issues that the treasurer of the town of Oakville has raised will be faced not only by municipalities, but by other institutions and by other merchants and vendors, by auditors and by governments.

On motion by Mrs Sullivan, the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Miss Martel: Perhaps I might advise the House of the business for next week.

Next week, on Monday 10 December, we will continue with Bill 1, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, and we will hopefully complete it. We will begin debate then on second reading of Bill 4, the Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act.

On Tuesday 11 December, we will continue with the debate on second reading of Bill 4 and hopefully then move to the debate on second reading of Bill 17, An Act to amend the Law related to the Enforcement of Support and Custody Orders.

On Wednesday, we will continue with the debate on second reading of Bill 17 and hopefully complete it then.

On Thursday, we will have the following: government notice of motion 5, the debate on second reading of Bill 11,

debate on second reading of Bill 16, debate on second reading of Bill 12 and debate on second reading of Bill 13.

The House adjourned at 1801.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

(130 seats)

First Session, 35th Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines, parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, Chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Hon Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Minister of Financial Institutions
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Wininger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of Justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Ron Hansen, Karen Haslam, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Margery Ward, Gary Wilson

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and Economic Affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward

Clerk: Todd Decker

General Government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government Agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Sharon Murdock, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Noel Duignan, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Bob Huget, George Mammoliti, Irene Mathysen, Bill Murdoch, Paul Wessinger, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public Accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Brian A. Charlton, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and Private Bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland

Vice-chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Paul R. Johnson, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson

Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources Development

Chair: Bob Huget

Vice-chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, Brian A. Charlton, Marilyn Churley, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood

Clerk: Harold Brown

Social Development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

CONTENTS

Thursday 6 December 1990

Members' statements

Alcohol abuse	2443
Mr McClelland	
Marguerite d'Youville	2243
Mr Martin	
School accommodation	2443
Mr Beer	
Professional engineers	2444
Mr Sterling	
Canadian Broadcasting Corp cutbacks	2444
Mr Malkowski	
Rent review	2444
Ms Poole	
Economic policy	2444
Mr Sterling	
Anniversary of Birchall-Benwell affair	2445
Mr Sutherland	

Statements by the ministry

Religious education	2445
Mrs Boyd	
Northern development	2446
Miss Martel	

Responses

Northern development	2446
Mr Brown	
Religious education	2447
Mr Beer	
Mrs Cunningham	
Northern development	2448
Mr Eves	

Oral questions

Constitutional reform	2450
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Scott	
Social services case load	2451
Mr Nixon	
Mrs Akande	
Mrs McLeod	
Children's mental health services	2452
Mrs Witmer	
Ms Swarbrick	
Court system	2453
Mr Harnick	
Mr Hampton	
Police investigation	2454
Mr Curling	
Mr Farnan	

Professional engineers	2454
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Allen	
Canadian Broadcasting Corp cutbacks	2455
Mr Dadamo	
Mr Rae	
Lumber industry	2455
Mr Conway	
Mr Wildman	
Automobile insurance	2456
Mr Runciman	
Mr Kormos	
Accessibility for the elderly and disabled	2456
Ms Haslam	
Ms Ziemba	
Plant closures	2456
Mr Offer	
Mr Mackenzie	
Alzheimer's disease clinic	2457
Mr Sterling	
Mrs Gigantes	
Plant closures	2457
Mr Mills	
Mr Mackenzie	
Gasoline prices	2457
Mr Miclash	
Mrs Carter	
Mr McGuinty	

Motion

Private members' public business	2458
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	2458

First readings

City of London Act, 1990, Bill 18	2458
Mr Winninger	
Agreed to	2458
Professional Engineers Amendment Act, 1990,	
Bill 19	2458
Mr Sterling	
Agreed to	2458
Insurance Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 20	2458
Mr Runciman	
Agreed to	2458

Government motion

Estimates	2458
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	2458

Second reading	Other business
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 1 2459	Anniversary of shooting in Montreal 2448
Mr Nixon 2459	Mr Rae
Mr Christopherson 2459	Mrs Fawcett
Mr Ruprecht 2459	Mrs Witmer
Mr White 2460	Advertising by members 2449
Mr O'Connor 2460	Mrs Carter
Mr Mills 2463	National Hockey League franchise 2452
Mr Hope 2463	Mr Sterling
Mr Bisson 2463	Business of the House 2476
Mr Mahoney 2465	Miss Martel
Mr Villeneuve 2465	Adjournment 2477
Mr Callahan 2465	
Mrs McLeod 2466	Lists of members
Ms Churley 2472	
Mr Sola 2472	Members and their responsibilities 2478
Mr Kwinter 2473	
Adjourned 2476	

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le jeudi 6 décembre 1990

Déclaration d'un député	Développement du nord 2446
Coupages budgétaires à Radio-Canada 2443	Mlle Martel
M. Villeneuve	L'anniversaire de la fusillade à Montréal 2448
	M. Rae

054629049

FEB 27 1991

